

# THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

---

JANUARY, 1878.

---

## ART. I.—SACRED HERMENEUTICS.

“THEN he said unto them, O fools. and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself. —And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them, he took bread and blessed it, and brake and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight. And they said one to another, Did not our hearts burn within us while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures?” (Luke xxiv. 25-32.)

Again: “He said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures; and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high” (Luke xxiv. 44-49).

We have before us a new work, poorly translated from the German,\* on the art and mystery of understanding the Holy Scriptures, which are able, we are told, to make us wise unto salvation through faith which is in Jesus Christ; and we must confess the impression made by it upon our spirit is dismal and dreary in the extreme. Can it be possible that this, or anything like this, is to be received in the way assumed by both the author and his translator, as the last best result, and pure net outcome of our modern theological science, on the field of what has been claimed here as its central ornament and distinction? Is this in reality the answer of the age to the question, How shall we communicate with the mind of God in his Word, so as to know that it is indeed his very voice we hear, and not the sound simply of man's voice, or the mere echo possibly of our own thought reverberated upon us from the inspired oracle? For many, the question may seem a matter of indifference. They are content to have the Bible just in that ambiguous shape. But no living faith in the Bible can ever be satisfied with any such view. It is a case of which we may say with the deepest emotion, "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" And just for this reason, a feeling of boundless desolation has come over us in reading the book to which we refer. We have not indeed pretended to read it in full. A cursory survey has been sufficient to put us in possession of its contents, as far as we could have patience to study them; but this has been enough at the same time to make us sick at heart. We once had some faith in the modern science of biblical exegesis. But for years, we have regarded it only as a great snare of the devil; and now we feel as if the last vestige of respect for it were fairly swept away from us by this late Berne-Andover publication.

Let it be well understood at the beginning, it is not with the idea of exegetical science universally, that we are declaring war, but only with what has come to be known specifically as

\* HERMENEUTICS OF THE NEW TEST. By Dr. A. Immer, Prof. of Theo. in the University of Berne. Translated from the German by Albert H. Newman.

this science in modern times. We are not dreaming for a moment, of subjecting the interpretation of God's Word to any other rule, than the objective theopneusty to which it owes its birth. No outward Church authority, no inward light of enthusiasm can ever rightly put itself in the place of this. The sense of God's Word must proceed from the Word itself; and this we see at once implies the necessity of its being so read, so studied, and so understood in its own heavenly constitution, that it shall be for men, in fact, the divine revelation which it claims to be in such form. Here then is room enough plainly to conceive of a true science of biblical hermeneutics, calling for the largest learning and profoundest thought that can possibly be impressed into its service. It is not with sacred philology in such character that we have here any quarrel. On the contrary it is just in the interest of the true method of studying the Bible in this manner, that we feel constrained to lift up our voice against the reigning hermeneutical science (falsely thus named), which has so mastered the general mind of the Christian world, that few alas have any power even to think of entering into the sense of the Scriptures scientifically in any "more excellent way." Our object is, to discredit and condemn the common theory of biblical exegesis; not just because we hold it to be false and bad in itself; but more particularly for the purpose of calling attention to what must be considered, in the nature of the case, the only true conception of any such science. And in order also, we may add, through the light of contrast and opposition, if possible, to awaken with some at least (rightly predisposed for the purpose) such an inspiration of faith in this conception, that they will find it impossible any longer to "seek the living among the dead;" but be led to look for themselves with open face into the Scriptures—where "beholding as in a glass the GLORY OF THE LORD, they may be changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord" (2 Cor. iii. 18). Something immeasurably beyond all the learning of such men as Semler and Ernesti, in its best form.

It may appear to some, perhaps, that we wrong the modern science of exegesis, by speaking of it as a common whole, bearing everywhere the same character from the beginning down to the present time; whereas, it comes before us in fact in the form of various more or less diversified, if not actually conflicting theories and schemes; each needing its separate judgment, and all showing at the same time a real historical movement of the dialectic sort, such as Dr. Dorner for example, in his *History of Protestant Theology*, tries to make out for the cause of Protestantism in general. We admit of course the force of this objection as far as it goes. There has been, indeed, a very observable historical movement with the science of biblical hermeneutics, reaching from the age of the Reformation to the present age; and we are willing to admit, moreover, that this movement has involved in it a real dialectic progression from the beginning, by which through continuous action and counteraction—the conflict of successional denyings and affirmings—the true interior sense of the science in question has come more and more decidedly into view, until it has become in full what we find it to be in our own day. In such view the history of it is full of instruction, quite as much so as the history of any other theological discipline or doctrine. But all this does not disturb for us, in the least, the force of our general proposition in regard to the science as a whole. It could not be historical without changes such as we have mentioned; but so neither could it be historical, without the unity of a common general life underlying these changes. And it is just of the science in such total view that we wish to be understood as now speaking, when we declare it to be unworthy of confidence altogether as a key to the right understanding of God's Word. Our business here is not at all with any secondary questions and points belonging to the scheme in its historical explication, but with the scheme itself back of all such details. What we wish to fix attention upon, is the essential radical defect of the scheme in its universal character. It is based from the outset on a wrong principle; and it is not pos-



sible that this wrong principle should not be found working in it as a power of falsehood and confusion in whatever aspect it may come into view.

The ground falsehood here charged upon the science of biblical hermeneutics in its reigning modern form, is nothing less than a misconception of the whole nature of divine revelation; by which the idea is virtually shorn of all real theopneustic sense, and made to resolve itself into the notion of divine thinking, brought down to the measure of human thinking, and so then compressed also into the terms of mere ordinary human speech. This is simple naturalism in its most hideous form. What we mean by it exactly will become more clear as we go forward.

The history of modern hermeneutics begins properly with the sixteenth century, and proceeds from that time onward through successive stages, with a movement answering in general to the law of progression ascribed by Dr. Dorner to the Protestant theological sciences in common. Writers on the subject take pains usually to decry all previous methods of explaining Holy Scripture (Jewish, Patristic, Medieval,) as childish, superstitious, or fantastic, for the purpose of magnifying the merit of what they affect to regard here as a new era gained at last for the study of the Bible.\* All before served at best, it is assumed, but to prepare the way negatively or positively for

\* And yet the old exegesis, we verily believe, rested on a better foundation than the modern. It abounded in all sorts of arbitrary license. It set grammar, logic, and common sense alike at defiance. But with all this it did full homage in its confused way to the idea of an infinite supernatural in the oracles of God, something very different from the light in which they are commonly viewed at the present time. Origen, we are told, stands at the head of this ancient Christian school. "Pre-eminent among his commentaries is that on the Gospel of John. His Christian Platonism appears here in full, arrayed against empty Ebionism, as well as against unbelieving Paganism. He adopts a threefold sense of Scripture, answering to the trichotomy of body, soul and spirit in man. He owns the literal sense, but sees in it only the shell of what is higher, just as the earthly nature of Christ was the shell of His divine nature. It was partly an exaggerated *idea of inspiration*, that led him often into fantastic, over-refined explanations." Exactly so; and just for that reason how immeasurably he transcends the level of interpreters, such as Hugo Grotius, J. Aug. Ernesti, or Moses Stuart.

what now took place, namely, the exaltation of the Bible to its proper supremacy as the rule of faith and practice for the Christian world. The interpretation of the Bible, however, soon came under the domination of the new Protestant system of doctrine. Hence, a period of scholastic tradition running into one-sided intellectualism, cold, hard and dry. Next, in the way of protest against this, we have in the seventeenth century the reaction of the Christian heart in the form of Pietism, inaugurated by Cocceius in the Reformed Church, and by Spener in the Lutheran Church. A most respectable, and at the same time most necessary movement all round, as may be easily seen. But the principle of the movement unfortunately could not be confined to its own limits. The Pietistic revolt against ecclesiastical dogmatism made room for a similar Rationalistic revolt against the same authority, which easily extended itself to a revolt against the authority of the Bible itself in every supernatural view. This is the form in which sacred philology, along with sacred criticism, is found challenging our consideration in the eighteenth century. It is common to speak of this as the transitional period of the modern science of biblical hermeneutics (as of our modern theology in general,) through which it has been happily led out of its previous wilderness of difficulty and doubt—not without vast conflict—into the state of rest and promise where it is now found. Two names stand especially conspicuous in connection with the movement,—Semler and Ernesti. The first is known as the father of modern biblical criticism. To the second belongs the credit of what we may call the instauration at least of modern sacred exegesis, in its present latest form.

Ernesti's *Institutio Interpretis Novi Testamenti* made its appearance in 1761, and soon found general acceptance in Germany. It fell in happily with the religious genius of the age, and became the natural expression of its want of firm faith in the supernatural character of the Bible. Ernesti himself still clung professedly to this faith, as did also his great cotemporary Semler, who seems at last to have shrunk in dismay

from the consequences of his own unbridled criticism. The truth is, however, the older supernaturalism could stand no longer in its old form. It carried in it a principle of self-dissolution from the beginning; and that principle had now got so far with its internal waste, that there was no longer any clear distinction between supernaturalism and the enemy it pretended to be fighting against on the opposite side. That is largely the theological amphibology of the eighteenth century, reaching over into the nineteenth century, and very generally, it is to be feared, down even to the present time. A rationalism on the one side, which affects to be the highest sense of the supernatural and divine. A supernaturalism on the other side, which affects to be the divine let down into the forms of ordinary natural thought and speech. These two engaged forever in a sort of mock combat, which resolves itself forever into mirage and mist, the only actual result being the commingling of the sham forces more and more into one and the same frightful array of common practical unbelief. For in such issue as this, it is not possible that the rationalizing supernaturalism should not ultimately give way before the open and confessed rationalism. Even its visionary victories are sure to be substantial defeats. It belongs at heart to the "army of the aliens" from the outset, and there only in the end it finds its proper home.

It is this phase of the theological life of the modern Christian world, in its relation particularly to the Bible, that Ernesti seems so well to introduce and represent in the eighteenth century. His system of interpretation has not been allowed indeed to pass without censure. It was not possible that the real religious life of the Church—which no rationalism could effectually extinguish—should not recoil, more or less sensitively, from the wrong it was thus made to suffer in the house of its pretended friends; and hence it is that we find subsequently strong efforts made in different directions, to break away from the shackles of the Ernestian doctrine, in favor of a more spiritual and vital interpretation of the Divine Word. And this, some would fain persuade us, has resulted in a new, higher

standpoint, doing away with the thorny dilemma of naturalism and supernaturalism altogether, and bringing in a general reign of peace, where all before was confusion and discord.

As something comically characteristic of the spirit of the age (in Germany especially), with regard to this subject, we cannot do better than to quote here a passage at some length from Dr. Immer's new book on Hermeneutics: "It lies in the nature of historical development," we are told, "that upon a dominant negation something positive must follow, and upon the domination of empty intelligence the reaction of a spiritual and heart-felt tendency. Various circumstances prepared the way for this revolution; other circumstances gave the immediate impulse. First of all, it was the appearing of the great German poets and their praiseworthy works, which awakened and disseminated the sense for the beautiful, the ideal, the purely human. Influenced in part by this awakening, and himself in part powerfully helping it, *J. G. V. Herder* (1744-1803) became a great source of influence, as for German literature and culture in general, so in particular for a more lively conception and treatment of the Bible. Diametrically opposed to all dogmatism and scholasticism, borne along by the idea of *Humanity*, he looked at the biblical writings also from the view-point of the beautiful and the purely human. In this interest, he wrote his treatise, *Die älteste Urkunde des Menschengeschechts*; his *Lieder der Liebe* on the Song of Solomon, otherwise always explained allegorically; and his brilliant work, *Der Geist der hebräischen Poesie*. He sought also to revive the study of the New Testament through his *Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament aus einer neu eröffneten morgenländischen Quelle*. From Herder proceeded the æsthetic treatment of Scripture; and though his works on this subject are more brilliant than thorough, more inspiring than exhaustive, yet must he be designated as the forerunner of the more recent theology. Another preparatory auspice was the change wrought in German philosophy through Fichte, Jacobi, Schelling, Hegel; indeed the vibration from absolute idealism and

subjectivism to ideal realism was already accomplished even in Fichte. This change ministered essentially to a fundamental and living comprehension of religion as we have it in Schelling's *Religion and Philosophy*, and in Daub's *Theologoumena*, but most of all in Schleiermacher. More than all else, however, did the years of war, and the inspiration of the war of liberty (1813 ff.), contribute to the awakening of religious earnestness and faith."

So our Berne Professor of Theology here; following out the same familiar line of thought that we meet with in Dorner, Hagenbach, and other German writers, who lay themselves out to span our modern ecclesiastical history with the rainbow of promise, where there is so much of dark cloud otherwise, it must be confessed, that looks ominous only of despair. Poetry, philosophy, humanism, the heavy scourge of the Napoleonic war—these are regarded as opening the way gradually, for Bible exegesis, from a dead past over to a living present. Mention then follows of different tendencies and endeavors, which are supposed to have worked together somehow (though by no means harmoniously) for the accomplishment of this end, during the progress of our own century. These we need not now more particularly notice. It is enough for us to say, that they do not amount in any case to a radical breach with what must be considered the general error that underlies the hermeneutical theory of Ernesti. They appear as qualifications simply of that theory, intended to hold the practical use of it under proper and safe control. The ground doctrine of Ernesti, therefore, must be regarded as being here the true and right test still for the modern science of biblical exegesis universally. The science has not got beyond the Ernestian basis anywhere. By this system then let it be judged. It may have other worth not drawn directly from the scheme it is thus found to rest upon; but that amounts to nothing for what we have here in hand. All must stand or fall together, along with the system or scheme on which all is bottomed.

The general principles of Ernesti's scheme are sufficiently

familiar. They have been received, Professor Immer tells us, as "the imperishable heritage of posterity"; and amount to this: That the notion of a manifold sense of Scripture is to be unconditionally rejected, and the verbal meaning of the text to be everywhere held fast—so that no allegorical or typical interpretation may be allowed beyond what is explicitly set forth in the text itself. That the verbal or literal sense of the Scriptures is of one nature with the literal sense of human speech generally; something common, therefore, to sacred and profane writings, since the Bible, as a revelation made to men, must necessarily be for the ordinary thought and speech of men, and thus necessarily subject in such form to the ordinary logical and grammatical rules of all such thinking and speaking. That any pretence, then, of governing such outward verbal sense by an imaginary *real* interior or spiritual meaning, actuating the words of Scripture from within instead of being itself passively actuated by the words from without—must be derided as presumptuous and vain. "False and ruinous," we are told, "is all interpretation of Scripture that explains the verbal sense according to the presupposed actual sense instead of conversely deriving the actual sense from the verbal."

This is enough for our present purpose. Neither is it necessary here to take up the question, how far the particulars of Ernesti's scheme thus broadly outlined may be able to bear critical examination even on the low merely human plane to which he insists on bringing down his subject. It would be an easy thing to show, we think, that the relation between words and their proper sense even here is something vastly less mechanical than he is pleased to imagine; that words, worthy to be so called *are* indeed always things, and not simply outward signs of things; that as mere *voces et præterea nihil* they are but spectacular unrealities, amenable to no art of interpretation, sacred or profane; that there never has been and never can be, any intelligible speech of man, oral or written, that has not owed its intelligibility to the presence of some objective spiritual substance in it, looking forth from it as the life and

.

light of the soul look forth from the face of the body it animates—without being themselves in any sense whatever an efflux or derivation from the body. These are mysteries, that belong to the world's common life, the sense of which lies imbedded in the universal thought and speech of men, far down below their ordinary empirical existence; for which reason it is no wonder, that the mind of the Christian Church, in the higher realm of religion, has ever found it impossible to acquiesce steadily in the idea of subjecting the inspiration of God's Word to any such merely human measure of interpretation as is presented to us in this philological Procrustes bed of Ernesti. Hence the various attempts we meet with on the part of the best theological thought of Germany in its later form—as represented, for example, by such men as Schleiermacher, Lücke, Olshausen, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, Stier and others—to get clear of all such preposterous rule, by forcing into view, as it were, what must still be regarded as the indestructible right of the Scriptures to be interpreted primarily from the living spirit that is in them, rather than from their outward letter. Their right in other words to be read from the shekinah of the Lord's presence in the cloud, rather than from the darkness of the cloud unilluminated by such presence. But such strivings after emancipation, as already intimated, could bring no real help for the cause of sacred exegesis, so long as they were fettered still by the original sin of Ernesti's theory; by the view, namely, that the Scriptures in their human character are like all other human writings, and must therefore be interpreted by the same principles and laws that we apply to the interpretation of any other book written by men for the use of men.

Dismissing then all farther regard to secondary points and particulars, we confine ourselves now to this one proposition so generally accepted by the modern science of biblical hermeneutics; the salient point, we may say, of all its errors and confusions. Is there any truth in the proposition? We take it boldly by the horns, and answer No. It is a wild bull of



Bashan let loose into the garden of the Lord's house, which has wrought only unspeakable mischief within its borders, thus far, and which no art of man can ever effectually tame into the service of either truth or righteousness! The proposition, as a root principle, is fundamentally, radically and fatally false to the whole idea of divine revelation. It sweeps away the universal doctrine of inspiration (the soul of all that is properly signified by the WORD OF GOD), in any sense that is not arrant nonsense.

That the principle affirmed in the proposition has in fact changed the old doctrine of inspiration is commonly allowed, and is indeed too plain to admit of any serious question. But this it is pretended, should not necessarily be regarded as the giving up of the doctrine; it merely shows that the doctrine, in its older form, labored under a flaw in its view of the relation of the divine to the human in the case, which needed to be dialectically worked out of it by the movement of history; and which has now been so worked out of it in fact, with pure gain only to the proper substance of the doctrine as it stood before, and no real loss whatever. This is the pretence; but it cannot bear examination. The flaw in the old doctrine may be allowed; but it was not necessary that it should be eliminated by sacrificing the divine side of it to the human. What the inward logic of the mystery really required was a deeper apprehension of the divine, sinking the human by comparison into its proper nothingness. Only so in the end can the idea of any real revelation of God to man have place in the human spirit. Only so can the relation of natural and supernatural, as it lies at the ground of all religion come ever to any actual reality for the faith or life of the Church. The attempt to rectify the untenable mechanism of the older theopneusty, in the way pursued by our reigning modern biblical literature, has resulted in just the opposite of this. The history of the eighteenth century may be characterized as an open conflict, between supernaturalism in its previous form, and the coming in of a general declaration of independence against the pre-

scriptive authority of the divine in every such view. The vital nerve of that supernaturalism, as is now commonly understood, was virtually paralyzed from the beginning; and so it fell over more and more from its own professed principle to that of the enemy; till finally, in our own century, by a sort of drawn battle, the two camps have melted more or less into one—with a common banner overhead, inscribed on the one side *Supernatural Rationalism*, and on the other *Rationalistic Supernaturalism*. Hence a supposed general rectification of the older orthodoxy (which it sorely needed), and as part of it that imaginary rectified conception of Holy Scripture of which we are now speaking; the end of which has come to be what we have here sorrowfully affirmed, the conversion namely of the whole idea of the word of God into what turns out to be at last simply the word of man.

If we look closely into the subject, we cannot help seeing that the doctrine of inspiration, as applied to the Bible, amounts commonly, with those who hold it at the present time, to no more than this—that we have in it, in some way, an outward communication of the mind and will of God made to us through holy men of God, in the forms of ordinary human thought and human speech. He is in heaven, we are on earth; but if He speak to us at all, it is assumed, it can only be by condescending in this way to meet us, so to speak, on the plane of our common natural life, where only his speech can be for us at all intelligible. How plausible this seems, how axiomatic one might say, for all common sense! How else, it may be asked, can the Bible be for us in truth the only rule which God has given to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him, if it be not before us first of all in the shape of such an outwardly intelligible canon or codex, whose authority we can then interpret and bow down to with the obeisance of true faith? Here, accordingly, room is supposed to be found for the reasonableness of the Christian faith. It rests upon the word of God contained in the Bible. But we are not required to take that word blindly or in the dark. The Bible appears before us with proper credentials—

evidences, as they are called, of its authenticity, genuineness, credibility, and inspiration; whole volumes full of which we may examine, if we please, before we consent to accept it as God's voice speaking to us from heaven. This makes our faith *rational* to start with, after which it is clear nothing can be more reasonable than that we should yield unquestioning obedience thence onward to what we have thus, by fallible reason, ascertained to be the infallible rule that God has given us to walk by in order that we may obtain eternal life. That certainly deserves to be dignified with the title rational supernaturalism; for is it not reason posted at the gate of entrance to the Bible, to assure us that she—*sitting* there as the impudent janitress of heaven—has tested its claims, and can now vouch them to be all correct. Nor is that all: The office of reason, under the view of such *ab extra* priority, cannot possibly stop there with this insinuating self-sufficient scheme. The Bible, thus rationally proved to be the inspired Word of God, being this in common human form, subject to the conditions of ordinary human speech, calls for ordinary human interpretation. It cannot interpret itself. There must be criticism, history, grammar, in one word a whole hermeneutical apparatus to make sure of what it teaches; and, as any one can see, this involves the umpirage of natural reason again to an unlimited extent. Who can say that the supernaturalism of the Bible may not be made by such mode of treatment quite as natural as the Principia of Sir Isaac Newton or the Koran of Mohammed?

The view of inspiration just sketched is found in combination with the most diverse theories of religion otherwise considered. It falls in readily with all sorts of evangelical orthodoxy, and finds its home with like ease in any of the sects composing the Evangelical Alliance. Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, and Episcopalians, show themselves to be here of substantially one and the same mind. And being of that mind, there is no real difference here in truth between them and others, who with more latitudinarian belief, and better insight, perhaps, into the real meaning of divine inspiration, openly

refuse to own it in any form. We do not mean to say that these various parties and tendencies in the Christian world regard the Bible in just the same way. Some, no doubt, may be better affected toward it, and render it better homage than others. But all suffer alike by falling short of the full idea of divine revelation. The ban of the modern science of biblical exegesis rests upon them alike. They labor alike under the common hallucination, that the natural must light the way for the right understanding of the spiritual in the Bible; whereas, it is only by the torch of the spiritual going before it, that the natural here can ever come at all to its true sense.

Who should not be able to see, that a divine revelation let down absolutely, by mere outward dictation or report to the plane of the simply natural, must cease to be a divine revelation altogether, in any strict and proper sense? The Bible in that view can be no more at best than a conveyance or translation of the divine over into the forms of ordinary human thought and speech, which in the nature of the case can bear no sort of proportion to the measure of the divine itself. Even the speech of angels must utterly refuse to fall into the circumscription of human speech in that way. How much more the speech or word of God? But just this monstrous presumption it is that lies at the foundation of the whole Ernestian theory of biblical hermeneutics, under the plausible sophism that when God speaks to men it can be only in the way of common human language, subject to its common rules of interpretation. That involves in fact a double metathesis or transposition; first, a change of the supernatural divine into the human or merely natural; and then a change of this back again, through human natural interpretation, to the beginning of the movement in the supernatural divine. But surely no such vicious circle as that can deserve to be taken for the direct speaking of God to man, which the full idea of inspiration implies. Human speech, as simply human, draws its quality always necessarily from merely human affection and thought. To be the vehicle of divine affection and thought then, it would seem to be plain, it must cease

to be merely human. It must, in some way, become immeasurably more than the common word of man, if it is to be strictly and truly the word of God.

"My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts. For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: So shall MY WORD be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it" (Is. lv. 8-11). What truly religious mind can help feeling in this passage—beyond all it means in the way of common philological exposition—the very power of the mystery itself which it so grandly proclaims; namely, the presence of the divine in its own transcendent character, shining directly *through* the veil of its human speech so as to make this also no longer human merely, but inwardly and essentially divine. The image of the rain and snow then, descending upon the earth, and causing it to bring forth seed for the sower and bread for the eater, is no longer image only, but positive living embodiment on a lower plane of what the word of the Lord is in the higher sphere of divine revelation; nothing less, in fact, than the life of the Lord, streaming forth continually from its own everlasting fountain in himself (Ps. xxxvi. 9), and filling the universe with its glory. Just, as everywhere in the Bible, indeed the order of things in the natural world in this way, is made to be the reflex and mirror (not dead, but living), of the order of things in the spiritual world. As where it is said, for example: "Forever, O Lord, THY WORD is settled in heaven. Thy faithfulness is unto all generations; thou hast established the earth, and it abideth. They continue this day according to thy ordinances; for all are thy servants. Unless THY LAW had been my delight, I should then have perished in my affliction" (Ps. cxix. 92). So in the

19th Psalm: "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handy work.—In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun.—His going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it; and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof.—The LAW OF THE LORD is perfect, converting the soul," etc. So, if possible, still more practically in the 147th Psalm: "He sendeth forth his commandment upon earth; HIS WORD runneth very swiftly.—He giveth snow like wool; he scattereth the hoar frost like ashes. He casteth forth his ice like morsels; who can stand before his cold? He sendeth out HIS WORD, and melteth them; he causeth his wind to blow, and the waters flow. He sheweth HIS WORD UNTO JACOB, HIS STATUTES AND HIS JUDGMENTS UNTO ISRAEL" (v. 15-19).

It would be a waste of words, we think, to go into any discussion of these divine oracles, for the purpose of enforcing the thought we have here in hand; namely, that God's word or truth is one everywhere, "quick and powerful," as it is said (Heb. iv. 12), and in universal harmony with itself; and that the order of its action universally, therefore, is from heaven downward to earth primarily, and never, according to the common preposterous imagination of men from earth upward to heaven. The oracles must be left to speak for themselves. Their inward voice is for the inward ear. If that be wanting, there is no help for them. They must become necessarily dumb.

Our general thesis it will be understood, is this: That the accepted ground maxim of the modern so-called science of biblical hermeneutics, which declares the Bible to be a divine revelation from God to men in the form of ordinary natural human language—subject for the right understanding of its contents to the ordinary laws of interpretation, as these are applied to other books of simply human composition—is an unsound and untrue maxim, which must sooner or later, where it is accepted, undermine the idea of revelation altogether (as it has indeed already done largely in the modern Christian world,) by subordinating the supernatural to the natural, and raising the

human into the place of the divine. Thus far we have held our argument to what we may call the immediate internal evidence of the subject itself. There is an immediate self-contradiction, as we have tried briefly to show, in the very terms that are employed to set forth the hermeneutical maxim in question. The imprisonment of the divine—the Word of God which liveth and abideth forever—in forms of human speech, made to be the inhabitation of its presence in common grammatical, logical, historical human sense, is a huge solecism, quite as much, we think, as the fancy of the rude African who thinks of his god as similarly imprisoned in a fetich of common wood or stone. When it comes with us to that way of looking at the Bible, the true doctrine of its inspiration is gone. We may stickle still for the shell of it; but inwardly it will be found to have for us, more and more, no real significance or power. So, we say, the argument stands, as derived immediately from the nature of the subject itself. There are, however, other considerations clustering, as it were, around this central idea, in general confirmation of our thesis, which we are bound in duty to it not to overlook. To these we now pass.

I. And here first we have to urge the *testimony of the Scriptures themselves in regard to the character of their divine inspiration*. They claim to be the Word of God, not simply as a body of heavenly truth reported under divine direction, in the forms of ordinary human thought and expression, but as the veritable mind and voice of the Lord himself, reaching from their own infinitude into these finite forms, and imparting to them a new divine significance, wholly above and beyond all their merely natural meaning. The proof of this does not lie so much in particular separate affirmations, as in the quiet tenor rather of the sacred books taken as a whole. Their tone habitually is that of authority, which is felt to be more than human, and which few have it in their power utterly to disregard. Hence the impression of their sanctity common to all, as of something continually issuing from the very bosom of the writings themselves. We have just now spoken of the way in



which the Bible lays weight on the *Word of the Lord*, of which it is itself the perpetual habitation and home; showing it to be in very truth one with the eternal Logos, "who is before all things, and by whom all things consist." This, of course, is not something that holds good only of some parts and portions of Scripture, such as we have quoted. It must extend plainly to the Bible universally, as being throughout, in its own view at least, just what it means in speaking thus of the word of the Lord. And then, just as clearly, all the other terms which serve to diversify this fundamental conception,—such as the law, commandments, testimonies, judgments and statutes of the Lord,—must be understood in the same living and pregnant sense. They are not dead, outward rules. They are not to be thought of for one moment as mere human formulas, significant of heavenly and divine things. They are the very presence of the heavenly and divine. Most certainly the law given from Mount Sinai was nothing less than that. The whole Jewish ritual was that. So all the testimonies, statutes and judgments belonging to the Old Testament, of which we hear such glorious things all through the Book of Psalms. All these meet together in the general conception of God's Word, and are but so many variations of expression for that everlasting *Truth* of God, which is at the same time his everlasting power and glory—the word by which the heavens were made, and which as the breath of his mouth still holds the universe together.

In our two articles (January and April, 1876,) on the passage, *The Testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of Prophecy*, we have shown at some length what is to be understood by the interior life which the Scriptures continually assume for themselves in the way here affirmed. They are instinct throughout with the revelation which God has made of himself in the mystery of the Incarnation of his Son Jesus Christ—by which room was made, through his glorified humanity, for the full advent of the new reign or kingdom of truth and righteousness in which is reached the last and highest sense of the world. This is the testimony of Jesus, the truth which he came into the

world to bear witness to, by the living actualization of it first of all in his own person. And the testimony of Jesus in such living view, we are told, is the spirit of prophecy, which means all Scripture given by inspiration of God. Such Scripture, then, is not a dead outward witness to the truth of the Gospel, mediated through the thought and speech of man in their common natural form; it is itself the very presence of the Gospel, its self-exhibition, not as notion or theory merely, but as positive life and power. The testimony of Jesus Christ in such living view, is in the Bible just as the soul of a man is in his body. And this single analogy serves at once to place the whole subject in its proper light. As the soul of the Bible, its vital inspiration, the testimony of Jesus must be in all and every part of the Bible. To talk of a distinction in it between what is Messianic and what is not Messianic, must be as absurd as to say that some parts of the body are animated by its soul and other parts not. And so then also, as it is only the soul shining through the body which can ever expound the true sense of the living man, it is but in keeping with this again to say, that the true interpretation of the Bible can never come from its exterior letter, but only from its interior spirit—the life of the Lord looking forth upon us from every part of the letter. The mystery in the one case is not a whit more difficult to comprehend, than is the mystery in the other case.

It does not need much reflection to see, that when Christ, after his resurrection, is said, in the text placed at the head of this article, to have “opened the understanding of his disciples, that they might understand the Scriptures,” it could only have been in this interior way. The illumination dawned upon them through the Old Testament Scriptures, lighted now into their true significance by his own presence seen and felt to be there; and while he talked with them, their hearts were made to burn with celestial fire. So it was then, and so it must be still, wherever it comes with man to any real understanding of what the Scriptures are as the Word of God.

II. *The order of all life in the world imperatively forbids*

*the thought of any real entrance into the sense of divine revelation from the simply natural side of our human existence.* A passing reference to this has already been made; but it is well to give it a little more direct attention. The universal creation of God cannot be thought of rationally at all, except as one grand whole bound together in all its parts, and distinguished at the same time into a succession of different spheres or grades, proceeding from God always in one view as the beginning of their existence, and in another view returning toward Him always as the end of their existence. This is that idea of order, of living law, of eternal truth, "forever settled in heaven," without which there can be no real faith in nature as the work of God, in divine providence, or in any economy of grace and salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ. In such serial connection, every inferior sphere of life must be dependent on that immediately above it; owing to this in fact all its causal springs of action. For how else could the whole refer itself to God as the first cause of all? Hence, also, the lower (or say more outward) existence must ever find its real meaning and purpose in the next higher (or say more inward) existence; and this can be intelligible only from the light that is in this, and never primarily from its own light separately taken. The lower or more outward existence seems, indeed, to be all the time putting forth efforts of its own to reach what is thus above and beyond it; but it is only by the power of the above and beyond after all entering into these efforts, that they can ever be of any avail for their own object.

Not to lose time now with lower illustrations, let us look directly at the complex of our own human life in its simply natural form. Here it is a life of mere bodily sense, a life of reflection, and a logical or so-called rational life; the whole unfolding itself in this order from infancy on to manhood. It seems as if the first in time here must be first also in being—the senses stocking the memory with facts, and these facts then by what is called the process of induction, leading over to judgment and ratiocination. But this is a grand fallacy. To what could

sensations and facts ever come in this way, if they were not met from within, at the proper time, by the previously latent life of the soul in still more inward form, taking hold of the *rudis indigestaque moles* thus presented for its use, and reducing it to order and shape? In this case, the office of the senses is intelligible from the more inward life of natural thought, and the office of this again from the reasoning life; but there can be no reversal of this order. Any imagination of that sort is simply absurd.

And what shall we say then of any such imagination, when applied to the whole natural life of man as related to his spiritual life? Here again that which is apparently first with us in time, is required to subordinate itself to what follows, so that this then is found to be in truth the deeper power that has wrought all along in what went before to bring it to its proper completion and sense. The Scriptures teach us most plainly the necessary unchangeable order of the process, by which alone it is possible for this great work to go forward with men; and all who have been awakened at all to the perception of what the natural and the spiritual are for men may easily perceive also how it is that they can be conjoined in this case only in that one way. The natural must be raised into one life with the spiritual and held in it by what is always the prior flowing of the spiritual into the bosom of the natural. This is what is meant by the mystery of regeneration, of which our Saviour says, Except a man be born again, born from above, born of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God, cannot indeed even see it so as to know at all what it is.

The mystery discloses itself first of all in the progressive coming together of the divine and the human in Christ himself, by which his humanity at last became fully glorified in and with the Father (John xiii. 32). There we have at once, not only the idea of the kingdom of God, but the entire actual power and possibility of it for men through all ages. The glorification of the Son of Man is the prototypal law of the new creation for all that are spiritually born into his image

and kingdom. He himself utters the law where he says to Nicodemus: "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven" (John iii. 13). Only he, therefore, can give power to others, believing on his name and thus receiving him, to become also sons of God—born in that case, not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God in Christ (John i. 12, 13). That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and as such merely can never by any possibility get beyond itself. If we are to be ever more than that, an advance which our universal nature demands—"groaning and travailing in pain together" toward its own completion in the form of a higher life—it can only be by the life of the Lord himself entering into us from the interior side of our being, as spirit and *not* flesh. To this flesh-bewildering, flesh-confounding wonder, the flesh itself which is to be thus regenerated can contribute nothing. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth: SO IS EVERY ONE THAT IS BORN OF THE SPIRIT" (John iii. 8).

Our object now in this brief exposition of the law which necessarily governs the relation of the natural to the spiritual in the kingdom of God—which is the law that presides in fact over the ways and works of God in the universe at large—has been to make way for its intelligible application directly to the subject we have here in hand; namely, the true order of thought and study for reaching the actual sense of God's word or speech as this comes before us by heavenly inspiration in the Holy Scriptures. That word there we have seen, must be concerned primarily and immediately, in all its parts, with the spiritual world and not with the natural. There we must look for its real animating soul. The natural side of it, therefore, can never be more than the external body of this soul, the enveloping cloud, so to speak, of the supernatural spirit that shines within. And how, then, are we to go about the task of understanding and interpreting the Scriptures, in which we find such strange marriage of the natural and the spiritual answer-

ing to the twofold construction of our own life under the same view?

There are three imaginable methods of procedure in the case. We may make the outward natural our manuduction to the inward spiritual; or we may try to work the two together as co-ordinate factors; or we may throw ourselves absolutely on the inward spiritual as first in order and power. Which of these methods are we to trust?

Our modern hermeneutical science, as we have seen, yields itself systematically to the first; only with more or less faint attempt to modify its bald rationalism in doing so, by coupling it irrationally with the second. But who may not see at once, how every such notion of mastering the spiritual by the natural—of seeing into the spiritual through the goggle-eyes of the merely natural—violates in reality the universal order of God's government; and is something therefore to be abominated as the sin of magic or witchcraft; the very conception of which indeed, as we have it in the Bible, is just the monstrosity of such diabolical inversion of the divine order of the world, nothing more and nothing less.

And hence it is that the Scriptures themselves everywhere, in the plainest and most unmistakable terms, pronounce the last or third method we have mentioned to be the only true and right door of entrance into their divinely inspired sense. What less than this is it, when St. Paul says: "What man knoweth the things of a man"—even his common mundane thoughts—"save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, BECAUSE THEY ARE SPIRITUALLY DISCERNED" (1 Cor. ii.

11-14). "He that is spiritual," it is added significantly, "judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man;" which is just what we have been saying, of the order which holds universally between higher and lower, interior and exterior, in the constitution of the world. From heaven to earth, from spiritual to natural, from inward to outward, that O ye men of science, is the indestructible law of all truth, right, and good, in the world. On this hangs the benediction of light, righteousness, and eternal life. The opposite of it is confusion, darkness and death. Why the benediction, and why the curse? Just because the light of life which is in the spiritual man, comes to him from a still higher or more interior source. "We have THE MIND OF THE LORD," the Apostle adds. Not as bare doctrine certainly; not as outward letter; but as the life of the Lord dwelling in His Word, and making it to be the efficacious medium of real covenant union with Himself. That is heaven. The want of that, all may see, is hell.

"I am the door of the sheep," we hear Christ saying; "by Me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture." This is of one meaning with the angelic word, the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy; and of itself determines the only possible order of entering into the sense of the Word of God, where only is to be found the true pasturage of God's people. "My sheep," he adds, "HEAR MY VOICE, and I know them and they follow me" (John x. 4, 5, 16). The Lord's *knowing* here (as in the Bible everywhere) goes causatively before the knowing that answers to it from the human side. The true sense, we may say, of Hagar's mystical word of old, *Thou God seest me*; expressing her sense of an inward illumination that came into her as it were from behind herself, a vision interior to her own (Gen. xvi. 13). In a profound sense, indeed, Malebranche was right; we *do* see all things only in God, or we could see absolutely nothing. To hear, to know, to follow, in the case before us, are as it were one act, brought to pass directly from the voice of the Lord, sounding in the depths of the soul. "I am the way, the truth,



and the life," Christ says; "no man cometh unto the Father but by me"—literally THROUGH ME (John xiv. 6.) No circuitous process in the way of outside teaching and knowing; but direct contact with the life of the Lord himself, present in his own Word. So only, and so always; "Every one that is of the truth," he says, "heareth my voice," (John xviii. 37). His voice in the Word comes to its echo and response, without outside intervention, in every such human spirit; and the only posture then meet for such divine correspondence, on the part of the human spirit, is that of the child Samuel in God's holy temple, "SPEAK, LORD, FOR THY SERVANT HEARETH" (1 Sam. iii. 9, 10).

III. The reversal of this order in our reigning mode of biblical interpretation, tends directly toward *the immersion of the spiritual in the natural, and is altogether opposed to the true idea of religion*. The spiritual side of our being here, in our present fallen state, labors under continual disadvantage from this; that it is necessarily enveloped, as it were, in our simply natural existence, which stands in direct open communication with the outward world through the body, and is able in this way to assert easily a bad precedence over the spiritual, by which the very reality of this is liable all the time to fall into obscurity and doubt, and too often, alas, into absolute practical negation. The only help for this is found in the new heart and new spirit, which the Lord has promised to put within his people. That regeneration from on high comes only through the celestial grace of his word, and the discipline of his providence, directed perpetually toward the one great purpose of humiliating the outward natural man in us, so as to make room for his own coming into us in the power of the new spiritual man. Answerable now to this twofold nature of man, plainly enough, is the twofold constitution of the Holy Scriptures also, in which we have what St. Paul calls the letter that killeth and the spirit that giveth life (2 Cor. iii. 6). How both are to be regarded and used for their common end, admits of no question. The spirit must rule the letter, being for it, in fact, just what the

living soul is for the body. And hence, just as the immersion of a man's mind in corporeal and terrestrial things is for him at once the eclipse of all spiritual and heavenly things—causing them to be for him as though they were not—so also, it is not possible that the putting of the literal or corporeal side of the Bible before the inward spiritual side of it, should not be attended with darkness rather than light in the same way. Alas, how much of our biblical study and learning for the last three hundred years, may it not easily enough be seen, has been just such an obscuration of the true spiritual glory of the Lord in his Word, through the merely natural thought and reasoning of men—"the sun and the air darkened by reason of the smoke of the pit" (Rev. ix. 2).

IV. Evidence of such disastrous evil we have abundantly in the actual results of the modern science of biblical hermeneutics, reaching down from the century of the Reformation to the present time. They show themselves, in one word, as a wilderness of thorns, an arid waste of unfruitful sand; reminding one only too easily of the prophetic malediction: "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord. For he shall be like the heath in the desert, and shall not see when good cometh" (Jer. xvii. 5, 6).

To listen to the voice of the science itself, one might suppose just the contrary of this; namely, that all had been darkness with the study of the Bible in previous times; that the first appearance of the science was as the rising of a new sun in the ecclesiastical heavens; that through more or less historical conflict, it has been all the time since battling its way to brighter and better success; and that now it may be regarded as being all that is to be wished, for the right understanding and explanation of the inspired volume. It needs, however, only a glance over such a work as Dr. Immer's *Hermeneutics of the New Testament*, to see the hollowness of this pretension. Hardly a point is made, hardly a question raised, in the discussion of the subject, which is not at once involved in mist, and brought into serious perplexity and doubt. At the very threshold we are

met with the question of divine inspiration—fundamental of course for all that follows—which is so muddled with cloudy definitions and distinctions that in the end we are able to make nothing of it whatever. Then comes the notion of revelation in its supposed relativity to inspiration, and along with this the more or less ambiguous resolution of both into the idea of special divine providence. Then the nice balancing of the divine and human elements in such fluctuating scheme of inspiration, turning it still more into fantastic unreality. The broad question again of the relation of the Old Testament to the New. How far the Old Testament is to be considered prophetic or typical at all of Christ: and by what rule we are to determine its Messianic portions (if it has any), from those which regard mere Jewish history in its proper natural form. Let these instances serve as examples simply of the way in which all things belonging to the book are given over to doubtful disputation; so that it would seem to be really in the end a sort of art and discipline for promoting uncertainty, far more than certainty, in the study of God's Word.

It is not too much to say of our reigning biblical exegesis, that so far as the sense of any real divine inspiration in the Bible is concerned, it is no better than chaos all round; a miserable wreckage of revealed truth, rather than the orderly science of it in any view. Passing by other things now, only see to what it has brought us with its critical and hermeneutical treatment of the Old Testament. An endless apparatus of learning, an almost boundless amount of herculean work; and the net product as near to zero as could well be imagined! Universal bewilderment in our churches on the whole great question, What think ye of these old Jewish Scriptures? Are they of God at all, in any sense transcending mere nature? and if so, in what measure and degree? In response to such crucial interrogation, in one direction, open unbelief; in another, silent mistrust; and in still another, the sheer obscurantism of blind obedience to dead tradition, determined to hold on to its confidence at any cost. All around, in this country at least, an

ecclesiastical confessionalism, in a dozen different forms; calling itself evangelical and orthodox; sworn to maintain such dead tradition, and ready to do so by mere brute authority, if need be, against all opposition; and yet itself, all the while more or less consciously, unable so much as to define even its own shibboleth in the case, and too cowardly then of course to venture a word beyond the barest *non possumus* of the Vatican in its defence. In the meantime, to all practical intents and purposes, the whole cause of what was once considered to be the *inspiration* of the Old Testament, allowed to lapse quietly into a sort of pious myth, much like the inspiration of Homer with the Greeks. Any real divine life, then, there may ever have been in it, fairly smothered out of it now by the preponderance assigned everywhere to its outward letter. This made to be the great battle-field, accordingly, for an endless war between the Bible and secular science; where the champions of the Bible are sure to come off always second best, because fighting, in truth, always on the same side with their naturalistic opponents.

In these circumstances, *by far the largest portion of the Old Testament history is taken to be a record of mere outside facts*, appertaining to the Jewish nation, loosely put together, with a great deal included that savors much more of man than it does of God, and which needs distillation by the most powerful alembic, to bring out of it any spiritual edification whatever. The Jewish ritual is looked upon still more as a congeries of many things that are unmeaning, joined with a few things that are darkly instructive as types, to be accepted as the Word of God only in the like loose way; and besides, has it not all come to an end, so that for us at least the divine that may have been once in it is all gone? Darkest of all in some respects are felt to be the prophetic parts of the old Jewish volume; largely rhapsodical—hard to understand—having often indeed, apparently, no grammatico-historical sense, as it is called, whatever.

Such, in general terms, is a faithful picture of what the Old

Testament has come to be for the life of the Christian world in our time. Either neglected altogether for the ends of vital godliness; or so externalized in the mere corporeity of its own historical form as to be shorn of its true God-inspired power of living sanctification altogether. And surely it needs no prophet to tell us that this catastrophe is but the legitimate fruit of the false hermeneutical science we have now under consideration; as it needs no prophet either to assure us also, that the catastrophe can never be helped in the least by this science. If the Old Testament is ever to be restored at all from such Babylonish captivity, it must be by a new advent of the Lord, and through the life of the Word itself. Then, and not before, will be fulfilled the oracle: "I will shake the heavens and the earth; and I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the heathen; and I will overthrow the chariots, and those that ride in them; and the horses and their riders shall come down, every one by the sword of his brother. In that day, saith the Lord of hosts, will I take thee, O Zerubbabel, my servant, the son of Shealtiel, saith the Lord, and will make thee as a signet: for I have chosen thee, saith the Lord of hosts" (Hag. ii. 21-23).

VI. Through this whole dream of mastering the interior sense of the Scriptures from their merely natural outside, there runs what we may call this judicial, self-stultification, *that the theory is never able to come to any clear apprehension of what is meant by the spiritual-internal in the Bible, as distinguished from its natural-external.*

Some sense of such a distinction there must be, of course, with all who consider the Bible to be a divine book; but it is wonderful how easily this is allowed to resolve itself with most persons, into the notion of a merely natural difference, such as we have in all common human speech. Words in this view have two sides, related as formal and material, or sign and thing signified; the first outward or corporeal, the second inward or spiritual. Then again the inward side here—the meaning of the word—is itself sundered into the distinction of literal

and tropical; which is felt somehow to open the way to what is still more inward; especially when the so-called tropical sense comes to figure as allegorical, or runs itself out into regular types. The lowest conception of a divine revelation in the Scriptures, however, find, itself, as it were, self-constrained to reach after something beyond this again, namely, felt communication in some way with the living spirit of such a revelation regarded as divine. So we have attempts in various ways to rule the exposition of the Scriptures, from a realistic plane of some sort supposed to be in themselves, above the immediate voice of their outward letter. The moral interpretation of Kant, the poetical interpretation of such men as Lowth and Herder, the dogmatical interpretation of theological sects and schools generally, may be taken as examples of this; very different in their animating spirit, we can readily see, and yet strangely enough, coming together here in what must be considered a common wrong against the true internal sense of the Bible regarded as the Word of God. For it requires, surely, no great effort of thought to see, that all these attempts are after all, as such, but reaches after the spiritual on the part of the natural man, which can have no power whatever in themselves, to induct him into the actual interior sense of the Bible in its own supernatural form. Instead of that, we must not hesitate to say, they work obstruction only to the apprehension of any such sense.

How much at fault our modern biblical exegesis is with regard to this subject generally, may be seen from a glance at the highly respectable work of Fairbairn on the Doctrine of Types, which has for its object, the author tells us, "to rescue the typology of Scripture, if possible, from the arbitrariness and uncertainty which have hitherto enveloped it, and to derive from it somewhat of real and substantial service toward the interpretation of the inward purposes of God." In looking into the book, we are struck at once with the way in which type and allegory, under the same general view, are made to take up the whole idea of what has been called the inward mystical

sense of the Bible in distinction from its literal sense. The early Church is blamed for its allegorizing spirit in this view, as guilty of a wild abuse; although it is only too plain that with such men as Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Ambrose and Augustine, this so-called abuse rested on a much deeper and sounder apprehension of the interior divine constitution of the Bible, as being the Word of God, than we meet with in Fairbairn himself and the modern typologists in general. For this modern typology, with all it has to say, more or less problematically, of a divine ordination in Scripture types as it understands them, never sees in them the very presence of the divine itself at all. They are at best but tropical expressions for what is supposed to be divine, on the plane of ordinary human thought; and in that respect just of one character with the disguised naturalism, which is all the time gnawing in the way we have seen, at the root of our reigning exegetical science generally. Fairbairn himself, indeed, in common with such men as Glass, Witsius, Cocceius, and Vitringa, sees Christ to be in some way the key to the right understanding of the Old Testament. He protests against the poor and meagre rule accordingly, "That just so much of it is to be accounted typical as the New Testament affirms to be so, *and no more*;" and nobly adds, "Were men accustomed, as they should be, to search for evidences of Christ in all Scripture, and to regard the inspired records of both covenants as having for their leading object the TESTIMONY OF JESUS, they would know how much they were losers by such curtailment of the typical matter of Scripture." This witness is true and good so far as it goes. But with all this, Fairbairn's Typology of Scripture brings no relief to the cause it undertakes to help. It does not get beyond the idea of what after all is only a natural outside testimony of Jesus in his own Word. It fails to recognize what that testimony means as the SPIRIT OF PROPHECY, the supernatural soul of the Word, present and active all the time in every part of it; a thought, before which the whole idea of type and allegory falls away, and all Scripture having the inspira-



tion of God in it, is felt to be a direct living effigy and parable of the divine in its own heavenly form.

Fairbairn's doctrine of types fails entirely in what it proposes to reach, namely, a sure and stable rule for the typological interpretation of Scripture, in opposition to the wilful extravagance that has too generally governed it in past times. There is no material difference, in this respect, between him and the early church fathers. He is just as arbitrary and uncertain in his rational way, as they are in their spiritual or mystical way. Only while their way was from inward to outward, from soul to body, *his* way is just the reverse—from outward to inward, from body to soul; the general *principle* of procedure being thus, as we have already said, unquestionably sounder on their side than it is on his side. He lays down five rules for determining the existence and meaning of types in the Bible; but the rules themselves are arbitrary altogether, and the application of them perfectly precarious.

His very first rule for example, involves his whole subject in midnight; declaring as it does, *that nothing is to be regarded as typical, which is of an improper and sinful nature.* Were this so, we should have to cut off at one stroke the spiritual significance of the entire history of the Jewish nation; for so far as the people themselves were concerned, that history answers but too truly, from first to last, to Isaiah's appalling picture: "Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil doers, children that are corrupters; they have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away backward" (Isa. i. 4.) So Moses: "They are a nation void of counsel, neither is there any understanding in them" (Deut. xxxiii. 28). And what shall we say of the twelve patriarchs, the sons of Jacob, or of Jacob himself? What shall we say of the incestuous Judah, of whose spiritual significance it is prophesied, nevertheless: "Thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise: thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow down before thee" (Gen. xlix. 8-12).—Judah—type, forerunner, representative of

the Messiah himself, the "Lion of the tribe of Judah!" The rule plainly is altogether untenable. The nexus between type and antitype, letter and spirit, in the Bible, is not moral in the way here supposed, any more than it is through logic or grammar. Let us thank God that the case is thus; that the credit of Christ and his kingdom is *not* in any degree staked on persons or transactions foreshadowing them in the Old Testament; and that we are not therefore put upon the desperate task of defending the religious character either of the Jewish nation collectively, or of particular bearers and representatives of its life, in order to vindicate the real inspiration, truth and sanctity of the Old Testament itself, or the divine spirituality of the New Testament as the legitimate birth and fulfillment of the Old.

We might urge still other considerations against the general Ernestian theory of biblical interpretation, going to show clearly how it contradicts the true glory of divine revelation, and throws over it continually (as with the Jews of old) the veil of Moses that *should* be taken away in Christ (2 Cor. 13: 15). But we have said enough for the present; and so conclude with the spirit-stirring prayer of THOMAS A KEMPIS:

*Non loquatur mihi Moyses, aut aliquis ex Prophetis: sed tu potius loquere, Domine Deus, inspirator et illuminator omnium Prophetarum; quia tu solus sine eis potes me perfecte imbuere, illi autem sine te nihil proficient. Possunt quidem verba sonare, sed spiritum non conferunt. Pulcherrime dicunt, sed te tacente cor non accendunt. Litteras tradunt, sed tu sensum aperis. Mysteria proferunt, sed tu reseras intellectum signatorum. Mandata edicunt, sed tu juvas ad perficiendum. Viam ostendunt, sed tu confortas ad ambulandum. Illi foris tantum agunt, sed tu corda instruis et illuminas. Illi exterius rigant, sed tu fecunditatem donas. Illi clamant verbis, sed tu ruditer intelligentiam tribuis. Non ergo loquatur mihi Moyses, sed tu Domine Deus meus, æterna veritas.*

J. WILLIAMSON NEVIN.

## ART. II.—REVELATION AND SCIENCE.

---

BY REV. C. Z. WEISER, D. D.

---

WE purpose to popularize a general theme: The relation existing between Revelation and Science. For the lay reader a still plainer statement may be framed, viz.: The wisdom of God, and the wisdom of man examined, compared, directed, interpreted, and made to harmonize.

No one can be mistaken in assuming, that there does exist a suspicion in the educated, in the half-educated, and in the uneducated portions of every community, of a fundamental contradiction between the declarations of Revelation and the results of scientific inquiry. Joshua and the modern astronomer, Moses and the geologist, are antipodes, it is taken for granted, amidst all the scintillations which the friction of learned controversy creates. Students in academies and colleges, physicians, attorneys, naturalists, and even not a few divines, we surmise, as well as many of no professional culture, shake their heads significantly and betray a misgiving of some kind, whenever the Bible and the Text-Book are uttered in one breath, or yoked together. This is an index, however flippant we may consider it, of the prevalent notion, that there does exist a discrepancy, after all, between what God teaches by means of a revelation, and that which man discovers through his unaided investigation. For a long period it has indeed been considered a wholly useless, and even profane task, by not a few scholars, both of the ecclesiastic and secular ranks, to attempt a marriage between theology and science. The best to be done in the case—and this was held to be quite a liberal position—it was supposed, would be to enjoy a certain dual view, *i. e.*, holding one opinion as good and faithful Christians,

and another, as profound students of Nature, leaving a chasm to yawn between—very much like that twofold code of morals which members of the Church of Christ allow themselves to walk by, on Sunday and on Monday, turn and turn about. Held thus “in a strait betwixt two,” they will, for instance, believe in the Holy Scriptures, as disciples, but at the same time advocate a system of chronology, cosmogony, a theory of history, which, as philosophers, they are in no way able to reconcile therewith. They assume that the Mosaic records and Cuvier’s discoveries are antagonistic, and can never be brought in accord; though both theories may be held without one affecting the other in the least. They accept the history of the confusion of tongues at the Tower of Babel as perfectly orthodox, and concede the incompatibility of the record with the many dissimilar languages now current, at the same time. They pronounce it hardly possible to sustain the origin of mankind, in all its varieties, from one common parentage, whilst yet it is extremely wicked to suspect Adam and Eve’s father-and-motherhood. Far from regarding revelation and science as bearing a sisterly relation, the one to the other, they take it, as the very best that ought and can be done, that they should be tolerating each other for the time being—like Jew and Samaritan; leaving the issue for some future day. Then follows the usual innuendo, of course, touching the impending crisis and its doubtful result.

Let us glance at the mischief and injury which such lukewarmness creates around itself. The indifferent and irreligious are vastly encouraged by such a religio-scientific doughfacedness, and look anxiously for the dawn of the tardy day, when this half-confessed conflict will and must come to the surface, in a ripened head; when the long-drawn warfare will end in a battle-scene; when the low mutterings of science will break forth in volcanic thunder-throes—of course, to the utter discomfiture of Revelation, Religion, and the Church. There is a large class of men who hold just such a thought, though few are impertinently bad enough to proclaim it. To the credit of our American civilization, we can mention but one “Thomas

Paine" and one "Robert Ingersoll." Without classing the skeptically inclined with this ignoble pair of brothers, we nevertheless believe, that the reason why so many philosophers, naturalists, philanthropists, statesmen, historians, jurists, poets, physicians, *et id genus omne*, are in doubtful relation is, the apologetical poise which even religious minds assume towards revelation and science. The faint-hearted Christian, in this way, becomes a traitor to the cause, and renders the wavering less steady still, whilst the enemy becomes more assured and boldly defiant.

The religious minds, too are sadly affected by such a pious duplicity. There will always exist a large class of good and true hearts, to whom all opportunities of examining the claims of either revelation or science must ever remain afar, but who are content to live by tradition. The members of this entire order must necessarily become more and more jealous of the researches of Science; prejudiced against its discoveries, and suspicious of the Greeks, though their hands be laden with the gifts of knowledge. There are divines who hate astronomy, *per se*, because of the apparent conflict between its positions and that of the Bible, touching the immobility of the sun and the orbital course of our globe. In a certain religious organ edited by a few theologians in Halle, it was declared that as long as no man's head was whirled off his shoulders by the pretended revolution of the earth, the Copernican theory could only be held by dolts and crackbrains. Is not geology vastly under *par* in the religious mart, because the more men read the written handwritings on the leaves of buried mineral-books, the less are they inclined to read and credit the revealed record? We well remember the consternation that arose among pious Americans—especially among the sturdy Puritans—when the study of the fishes was first reduced to and catalogued into a separate science. There was the story of Jonah and the narrow throat of the whale—two things that would not fit. Only a Dr. John Pye Smith restored a calm by telling aloud, that the divine record only claimed a *big fish*, and that certainly some such sea-

monster ploughed the deep, that might swallow the fugitive. We hold that the secret and out-spoken feeling against schools and colleges, against education even, may be traced to such a suspected conflict between revelation and science. There are good and true patriarchs among the faithful, who relish a rhapsody of zeal without knowledge, from the lips of one who never was spoiled by an institution of learning and vain philosophy, who reads the Bible only and is moved by the Spirit directly, far more than the logical discourse of an educated and profanely trained pulpit performer. Whence this jealousy of education, now? The answer is at hand. It is owing to a presumed, or conceded contradiction between religion and education. It is still thought, as of yore—"much learning maketh mad."

We have lifted to the surface some of the prominent consequences of the popular doubt entertained on the subject in hand. It leads one class to mistrust, ridicule and despise revelation, the Queen of Sciences; whilst it induces the other party to discourage, undervalue and denounce Science. We hear two party watch-words, in consequence, to wit:—"The more ignorant, the more devotional." "The more learned, the more ungodly!"

We offer ourselves as a mediator between the two parties in conflict and shall endeavor to play a wholly impartial and just part. Our argument runs thus: *Revelation and Science do not and cannot contradict each other, because they are wholly separate and distinct spheres.*

If parallels, be they lines or spheres, will not interfere, no matter how far we extend them, may we not conclude the same with reference to the two kingdoms which we are just now entering? The vital point, however, is their parallelism. And to this we will now address ourselves with all becoming modesty, we trust.

In the Norse legend the blacksmith, Amilias, having made an impenetrable armor, challenged his brother blacksmith, Mimir, to cut through it. Mimir forged a sword and brought

it down on the encased Amilias, who said he felt a chill merely. "Shake thyself," said Mirmir, and Amilias fell in two. In imitation of a prominent educator, we will trace a dividing line in the field of knowledge, which distinguishes two general and all-embracing orders—Natural and Supernatural knowledge. The empire of knowledge, like Amilias, may be neatly halved. Natural knowledge is that vast store of learning which we acquire by means of our natural faculties. The eye, ear, nose, tongue, hand, reason—all our senses are our instruments, servants and purveyors in this field. The territory opened out for us to harvest in is the world, this physical world in which we find ourselves located, and of which we form a part. The sphere, the means, the results are all of the natural order, no matter to what extent the course is prosecuted. One takes the bosom of the earth for his chosen field and studies the number and order of its strata of dust and rock; the names of all its minerals; their nature, appearances and qualities; its mines of precious metals and ore. The treasure-trove is large and valuable, which he finds concealed, locked and walled in, as if in the vaults which God built. He uncovers them all, like the golden dungeons of Golconda, Australia and California, and by such an apocalypse furnishes volumes of learning for man. Another trips like a fairy through fields, meadows, lawns and gardens, lighting on trees, shrubs, and flowers, to greet and acquaint himself with every blooming beauty, or member of the vegetable kingdom, as angels know the kingdom of God. Still another spends his time amid an ocean of insects, to know their names and habits, as they fill the air, earth and sea. And then another, again, rests not until he can number the sparrows, tell their speech, instincts and dispositions. And, once more, we point to him, who can describe all animals, like another Adam, from the mouse to the elephant. Let these examples suffice. We have an idea of the field opened, and of the number of reapers engaged therein. The entire plain of Nature is being occupied—the heavens, earth and sea. There is nothing covered that shall not be re-



vealed. Every naturalist is a veritable Columbus, who discovers continent after continent of knowledge.

Human society, likewise, affords rich and large spheres for the natural student. The different races of men; the numberless languages and dialects; the various forms of government; the arts, useful and beautiful; the several professions, callings and trades. Here are many places for men, and many men for the places. Hence we have philanthropists, patriots, statesmen, jurists, physicians, artists, mechanics, tradesmen, farmers—a place for every man, and a man for every place.

But boundless as the domain appears to us, its limits are, nevertheless, set. All our survey, and much more that might be detailed additionally, lies wholly within the domain of *natural* knowledge. The physical universe confines all romancers to itself, and will not suffer them to escape beyond its bounds. Natural knowledge, no matter what compass you allot it, has to do with the natural world—with the *whole* of it, indeed—but with not one hair breadth beyond or outside of it. It commences with matter, goes as far as matter goes, and stops where matter stops. There are flaming cherubims, as it were, guarding the horizon of the economy lying adjacent to the present world, and warning the naturalist—"Thus far shalt thou go, but no farther!" The fact that an ass can recognize the angel-guard, whilst its rider did not, only confirms our proposition. Let the scholar enter his field boldly, to observe the thousands and millions of phenomena and facts lying at his feet; to ascertain, compare, combine, arrange, classify and catalogue them for his own satisfaction and the edification of his kind. Here, again, that word of Jesus finds a literal application—*The field is the world*. The province of *Natural Knowledge* dare not be circumscribed within any narrower limits than we have assigned it, we hold, on the one hand; nor dare we enlarge it, on the other.

But, pray, where shall we discover the domain of *Supernatural Knowledge*, now? Is not all conceivable room taken up, occupied and possessed already? It would indeed seem so;

but things are not what they seem. Were it given us to contemplate God's works, in the visible and invisible world, not as we see them now, in shreds, patches, and little oases, but in their entirety, woven together into the great web of universal harmony: could our finite minds take in each part thereof, with its general and particular surroundings and connections, relations and appliances—then, no doubt, Supernatural Knowledge would appear to rest upon and fit so completely and necessarily into the general body of natural knowledge, as that all would seem crippled and unfinished, if by any means the former complement were withdrawn. Then might we be confronted with spectacles as unnatural and monstrous as the truncated cone presents, the pyramid robbed of its apex, the steeple without its spire, a man without his head. "And if any man think that he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know." (1 Cor. viii. 2).

The plain question now confronts us—What is Supernatural Knowledge? Supernatural Knowledge has to do with that still more marvelous universe beyond this; of which, not His works, but the Creator Himself is the fulness; and in the wonders and mysteries of which, we are instructed, not by our own natural powers and capacities, any longer, but through His direct communications, through His electric messengers, through the medium of Revelation. This mysterious world begins and ends, not with outward facts and phenomena, not with Nature and its laws; but with the Author of Nature, with the One, Invisible, Unapproachable, Almighty Cause and Source of all things. Supernatural knowledge can only receive, learn, unfold and arrange *what God chooses to tell us of Himself*. He alone can lift the vail which envelops His Nature, Attributes, Will. "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" (Job xi. 7). This sort of knowledge begins where natural knowledge stops short, and conducts us onward. It has to do with the Father of Spirits, with our own spirits, with conscience, with the moral order of things, with duty, with the

past, present and future relation and history of creature and Creator.

This is the sphere of Supernatural Knowledge, as caught by a bird's eye, let us say. But the vision is comprehensive enough to enable us all to discern the separate and distinct provinces with which the two orders of knowledge, Natural and Supernatural, have to do. The several provinces lie as far apart, in kind, as the Sun and the Earth, indeed. And being at such a distance from each other, in nature and kind, this is just the place to ask the pertinent question—How can they ever clash or quarrel? Planes so far removed from each other, and having such separate orbits—can these ever conflict? In their normal relationship may the sun and the earth fly against each other? Just as unnatural is it, then, to speak of a conflict between Revelation and Science. Each in its own orbit, the one will never interfere with, nor beat the other from its own track. The potter's trade and the painter's art let each other severely alone. Cannot the theologian and the naturalist behave as well, the one to the other? Observing a proper etiquette, each to the other, the two characters will as likely run a race, as the Polar bear and the Tropical ostrich. The naturalist has his own separate and peculiar sphere, his track laid open and marked out. He can neither depart left nor right, but must follow whither it leads, unless he transcends his prerogatives. He has to deal with matter or material objects, go as far as they go, and stop wherever they stop. He may not advance an inch beyond—should he venture, he ceases to be a naturalist at once, and is false to his mission as such. He acquires all his stock and store of knowledge, however sublime it may be, by means of his natural powers, his senses and reason. He is welcome to the whole of it, and shall have due credit allotted him, for his honest and faithful toil and large success. But he must not attempt to pilfer from a foreign territory by illegitimate tools, or his honor and fame, as a naturalist, is gone. He may discover, examine and judge all that Nature lays at his feet; only this, however, and nothing more. The

shoemaker must not only stick to his last, but to the proper *tools* of his craft, as well, lest he be no longer entitled to a place in the brotherhood of cordwainers. By all this we mean but to say, that a naturalist ceases to be a naturalist, the moment he transgresses his bounds, and transcends his powers and instrumentalities. It ill becomes him to deny the realm of the Supernatural, when he is actually invading it, whether aware of the fact or not, and flippantly ignore its reality, because he is using instruments which are about as well adapted to success, as the telescope is for divining the secret of the earth's centre. As a naturalist he is bound to remain within the domain of the natural and employ only natural implements, if he would maintain his honor and ply his calling legitimately. This done, no divine dare interfere with his business.

The Theologian has his own sphere, as well. This is far removed from the territory of the Naturalist, however. He looks only at moral laws, at principles; he works in spirit and mind, and knows only that which God chooses to reveal in an extraordinary and supernatural way. Are the several spheres not as separate and distinct from each other as is the weaver from the blacksmith's? In our vast cotton-mills, hundreds of working hands are employed, without ever hindering one another. Why? Each one has his place and task. Cannot the theologian and naturalist labor on without interference? They occupy far distant and opposite points, indeed. The former begins with and walks, Enoch-like, with God, working downward, earthward; whilst the latter starts below and ascends. The latter may indeed close his upward beat where the former will descend to, in his downward flight, but as neither may cross the line, we have a coalescing and harmony, rather than a quarrel or collision—a mutual embracing, verily. The theologian gives you the *reasons* and *causes* of facts, leaving the philosopher to occupy himself with the facts themselves. The former treats of the primary and final cause; the latter, of secondary causes—the laws of Nature, as they are termed, by wholesale. Hardly has the philosopher done discoursing on Law and Government,

when the theologian takes up the theme and expatiates on the Author of all laws, the Ruler and Governor of human society. Why may not two workmen, then, whose posts of duty stand so far apart, continue to labor on without a declaration of war? The husbandman and the sailor pursue their separate callings to the end of time, without any clashing. Certainly they do, since one ploughs the earth, whilst the other ploughs the sea. The pastor and the physician meet in the same sick-chamber, and treat the same patient. One ministers to the soul, the other, to the body. An interference can only be imagined, in case either one should, step out of his peculiar sphere, when, *e. g.*, the clergyman dabbles in patent medicines, and the doctor turns exhorter. If so, then we may declare that the divine and the savant are not likely to fall into a combat, since the one works on spirit, the other, on matter.

Here, then, are two distinct worlds to study. Each one is only justified to speak of his own province. The man of science does not learn from revelation; nor does the theologian drink at the fountain of science, to know the mysteries of revelation. Why not? For the same reason, that no one would consult a poet in order to know the laws of trade and finance. His material is not answerable, his tools are not adapted, his knowledge is not of the requisite kind. His profession lies in a wholly foreign sphere.

It is from losing sight of the fact, that the theologian and scientist occupy separate fields, that all confusion arises. A familiarity in one department does not imply, necessarily, an equal aptitude in the other. It is possible to range over the whole domain of the one, to know physics, politics, geography, history, and the arts, without knowing, on this account, the nature of God, of one's own soul, whether there are angels, or their orders; whether there is an hereafter, a happiness or misery beyond. So the most learned of divines, St. Augustin, or St. Thomas himself, will not by virtue of their professional knowledge, be able to discourse on the laws of nations, or trade. Humboldt has written a *Cosmos*; and how little did he

know or care about the Logos! Prof. John Tyndal invented a Smoke Respirator; but his Prayer-gauge—what a puny toy for a big man! Had a Paine continued to run in the political groove, he might have gone into Congress; by presuming to uproot the Christian religion he ——— went to his own place. The two spheres themselves, however, may move on—each in its own orbit—as the heavenly bodies above us in countless numbers, without ever conflicting. The repeated threatenings to the contrary, are like the oft-repeated prophecies, that the tail of an angry comet will stray and strike the earth some day and wipe it out.

But, it may be asked, why are there, then, those loud and angry controversies between the Theologians and Scientists? Verily, there always have been, and will likely continue to be, quarrels between the characters standing in these opposite fields. But, let us bear in mind, that the warfare rages between the *heroes*, rather than between the two systems. The latter are not antagonistic; but their several interpreters, advocates and devotees may do valiant fighting against windmills. False interpretations are set afloat, which ignorance and prejudice may defend; but for all this the systems should not be held accountable. Hold Revelation to all the contradictory whims of many of its commentators, and the Bible becomes like a lump of softened clay. Judge of the Empire of Science by the chatterings of its children, and Nature is a Devil's theatre. Mistaken mortals, brave champions though they be, will always disagree; but the systems never. Is not God the God of Nature as well as of Revelation? Would He declare in one what He must recall in the other? Can we intelligently conceive of such a conflicting dualism?

But are not by far the greater number of learned men skeptics? If Revelation and Science are in such twin-sisterly relation, the one to the other; if their mutual attitude be one of harmony—why is the majority of learned minds infidel? These questions merit a reply. First of all, it is not a correct proposition. It is not to be admitted for a moment, since facts

do, by no means, substantiate it. The greater proportion of wisdom, intelligence and profound knowledge, is not lodged in infidel minds, if these terms are taken in their proper sense. Just the opposite holds true. The largest stores of learning are ever to be met with in men who stand on the side of God, rather than in the school of Mammon, or in the synagogue of Satan. To one Humboldt we can count ten Bacons and Leibnitzes. Against the swarm of monomaniacal scientists, respectable as their acquirements are, a score and host of profound scholars might be marshalled out, aside of whose intellectual depth and thorough knowledge in various directions, the stock of the former would seem like superficiality itself. Depth craves a corresponding height, and really profound scholarship craves Revelation as a proper cap-stone to the Temple of Science. The mental stream, like all others, tends up as high as its source—to Shiloh's brook which flows fast by the Throne of God.

We will concede, however, that many able minds are skeptically inclined. But why should they be *expected* to be any otherwise? What patent reason may we assign, that a man of science, physics, politics, trade, business, or connoisseur in any profane sphere, should be a highly religious mind also? Because of his knowledge, we are told. But his knowledge of what, let us ask? Because of his scientific knowledge. But we have just seen, that a mind never so well versed in science, cannot, *on that account*, be presumed to be familiar in the sphere of Revelation—as little may we assume the latter, as that one who is skilled in the art of painting, became such by studying pottery. The Astronomer Leland said: "I have never seen God at the end of my telescope." A Wilberforce had been learned long ere he became a Christian philanthropist. He by chance, as we say, read the New Testament in Greek, and from that time forward only found the treasures hidden in another field which he had previously never trodden in all his tours after knowledge. Why should a Thomas Jefferson necessarily be a religious man, when he perhaps studied



statesmanship, politics and governmental matters exclusively? By roaming over the field of Science, we are not conducted into the realm of Revelation. "Through Nature up to Nature's God" is a poetical alliteration which affects the ear pleasantly enough, but it affords us but a frail Jacob's ladder, after all, judging from the few souls that have stormed the heavens over that road. There is as little ground to hope that a purely scientific education (in the technical sense) should familiarize us with the mysteries of Revelation, as there is to expect much knowledge of Africa from a traveler over the continent of Asia only. The books are wholly different—as Greek is from Latin, or Hebrew from the English. He may be a corypheus in one view, and but an abecedarian in another. There is much point in the saying of the Christian Apostle:—"Is any one wise"—skilled in science and worldly wisdom—"let him become a fool"—a simple school-boy—"that he may be wise"—in the sphere of Revelation. "For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." 1 *Cor.* iii. 18-19.

During our youthful ministry we numbered among our hearers an intelligent and skilful physician, who had traveled in foreign lands and elevated himself far above a routine doctor. But he was a skeptic, and the son of an infidel father and grandfather. We handed him a volume of Balmez. After four months he returned the work, and remarked: "I never thought of being a believer before that book introduced me into the mysterious history of Christianity." The long and thorough course of political and statecraft study never brought Clay or Webster to see God or their individual relation to Him. It was the parish minister with the volume of Revelation in hand. The address which Revelation makes to philosopher, scientist, naturalist, to astronomer, chemist, geologist, to artist, mechanic, merchant, to any and every worldly-wise man, is after this tenor:—"I come not to teach you in your professional task, to interpret your own book. That is apart from my mission. But would you know of another world, of brighter suns and stars, of treasures of untold and unfading

value, then must thou take counsel of me. Of the world to come and of its powers, of thy soul and all souls, of thine origin, relation and destiny, of the whence, the what, and the whither of man and things—of these I can tell thee, and I alone." Let us not fear, then. Science is on good terms with her fairer and nobler sister—Revelation, though her friends may be angered. Let a geologist charge Moses with a lie. Let Gibbon snarl, and Volney sit upon his ancient ruins "sapping a solemn creed with a solemn sneer." Let Klaproth deny the dispersion of languages. Let Virey deny the unity of the race. Let every position of Revelation be questioned. Truth comes out all the fairer. Sunshine emerges out of a fierce storm. No system has ever laid itself more completely open to detection, if it conceals an error, falsity or fraud; no book ever gave so many clues to discovery, if it holds an untruth in its folds, than the system or volume of Revelation has done. There are boldly recorded the earliest and latest physical revolutions of our globe; the dispersion of the human race; the succession of monarchs in surrounding countries; the habits, manners and languages of various nations; the great traditions of mankind; and the recital of many marvelous and miraculous events, not to be found in any other work. All these were projected into the future, as it were, against which no skill, no ingenuity could possibly afford protection. And has modern science discovered a flaw? Not the name of a single Egyptian Pharaoh had been invented to suit convenience, or the uncovering of the Hieroglyphic Alphabet would have brought it to light, three thousand years later. Had the history of creation, or of the deluge been a fabulous or poetical fiction, the toilsome journeyings of the geologists among Alpine valleys or in hyenas' caves in unknown islands, would have proven the myth. Instead of that, the discoveries of Nineveh's ruins confirm the narratives. Every step which Science takes, in its own proper onward direction, increases the circumstantial evidence.

Right well do the defenders of Revelation know the safety

of their creed. They challenge the votaries of Science to go forward, or themselves go in advance and beckon them onward. And yet have the impugners of truth not ceased to taunt Revelation with an hostility to Science. The popular falsehood is coined and current on and on—"Ignorance is the mother of devotion." Though the voice of inspiration preaches from house-tops and street-corners—"For the soul to be without knowledge is not good"—yet will the calumniators join and trumpet the slanderous chorus. Whence is this, if it be not the prompting of Satanic malice? Even the Middle Ages, the so-called "Dark Ages," afford us an unanswerable refutation. Then the Church had everything in hand and regulated it after her own mind. And what do we behold along the track of history through those ages? The Modern Languages formed themselves into being—Italian, Spanish, German and English. Modern Poetry began to jingle, the Songs of the Troubadours, Dante's Divine Comedy; Petrarch and Chaucer followed. Paper was invented in the X. Century. The art of Printing belongs to this period—1436. Universities were founded, Oxford in 886, Cambridge in 915, Paris in 800, and a galaxy of others. Jurisprudence commenced to form in the XI. Century. The gamut was arranged in 1142; the Mariner's Compass in the XII. Century. Navigation became a science and America was discovered amid all this reputed night. The first Bank was founded in Venice, in 1157; the first plan for a Post Office was conceived in Paris, in 1285. Spectacles were mounted; Gun-powder first blazed in 1320; Coal was quarried in England, in 1307; Glass was used already in the V. Century; Arithmetical numbers were introduced in Europe in 991; the clock was known in the XII. Century; and Painting was revived in Paris in 1300. Surely, the Church could have been no enemy to Science then. That Professor John Tyndale's lecture before the British Scientific Association should create such a stir, does not speak well for modern scholarship, on either side of the Atlantic. It argues an intellectual abasement and historical blindness, our boasting to the

contrary notwithstanding. There is nothing actually new in all the Professor said. It is *crambe bis repetita*. What he serves up, the Pagan Demetrius had told 500, B. C., and Epicurus, 341, B. C., and Lucretius, 96, B. C. Theologians had gone over it many hundred times, and now smile over his rehearsed speculations touching the great facts of creation and God. Of course, Dr. Draper, and Whewell, and Prof. Youmans, and others of their school are delighted. This is not a solitary instance of such self-deception. Bayard Taylor tells us: "I saw in Memphis, in Ancient Egypt, the oldest city in the world, the very articles we now make and sell as products of our age, glazed crockery, kitchen utensils, baskets, and toilet articles." Wendell Phillips' lecture on "The Lost Arts," tells the same tale. But Galileo silences all we have said! Was not the Church in opposition to science then and there? Not any more than ever before or since. The doctrine which Galileo revived—we purposely say, *revived*—had been broached by Pythagoras, the Pagan, 550 years B. C. Ptolemy of Egypt confuted and denied it 135 years B. C. Copernicus, of Poland, revived the true theory in 1543. Tycho Brahe, of Denmark, denied the latter, in 1586. And so the quarrel continued *pro* and *con*. Then came Galileo, in 1610. Two parties stood at dagger's point. Now the Church spoke in language such as this:—"My children, this is a scientific problem; and as long as you treat it *as such*, your liberty is boundless. Go forward with your investigation and discovery. Do not, however, intermingle this scientific riddle with the articles of Faith and Revelation." Neither party heeded this prudent counsel, but waxed still hotter, quoting and misquoting Scriptural phrases, and compromising the mysteries of the Kingdom of God. Finally, the Church interdicted the current habit of mixing Theology and Astronomy. Galileo was obliged to recant. Recant *what*, let us ask? The true theory of the Universe? That cannot have been the object of the interdict, since the Church had not pretended to decide on that matter. Galileo recanted his imprudent utterances, by which articles of Revelation had been

confounded with affairs of Science. That act of imprudence he *did* recant; but stamping his foot, he emphasized his individual belief as a scientist, and formulated it in the memorable words: "*It still moves!*" The fact that the brave philosopher was not punished for contempt—a lot most likely to befall any one guilty of like conduct in a court of justice, in this age—but was suffered to applaud his own theory to his heart's fill, so long as he but asserted and defended it as a purely scientific speculation, shows plainly, that the Church was not inimically set against the progress of science, but solely against its admixture with Revelation. She permitted Galileo to prove that the earth moves as best he might, and at the same time herself proved that she could *not* move from the position taken, as the guardian of Revelation. The story of Galileo is an old and oft-told one, which, like all others, gathered volume and strength as it rolled on and on. But an impartial view of the records enables us to see how often good men, indeed, are gone wrong. And with the toppling over of this idol of the scientist, we say with Julian the Apostate—"Galilean, Thou hast conquered!"

NOTE.—The following Lectures were frequently consulted in the preparation of the foregoing Article, viz.: Wiseman's, Newman's, Tyndall's Goodwin's, Youman's. In some instances we clothed their thoughts in garments of our own make, and in others we arrayed our thoughts in suitings of their hands, whilst both matter and form may be owing to them, in other instances. Honor to whom honor is due.

## ART. III.—ABELARD AND HELOISE.\*

FROM THE GERMAN OF DR. K. F. A. KAHNIS, BY PROF. N. C. SCHAEFFER, PRINCIPAL  
OF KEYSTONE NORMAL SCHOOL, KUTZTOWN, PA.

I INTEND to-day to carry you back to the mediæval world. Protestantism at first could not rightly understand and appreciate the bright side of the middle ages, because it was too deeply engaged in the struggle with the effects of those ages. Since that time, however, there have sprung into activity, in the sphere of art, religion and science, impulses and tendencies, which have brought us nearer to the *living forces*, that built the castles and domes of those days, that deposited among our common people a treasure of legends, customs and traditions, that invested the Church with world-ruling popes, with mysterious rites, with saints, relics and places, the resort of pilgrims, and that gave science a living embodiment in the universities of that period. Protestantism must, of course, always protest against a mediæval hierarchy; but it has learned to understand that among the young Germanic nations, who were first to be trained for freedom, it was necessary for the Church to assume a disciplinary character like that of the Old Testament. Especially has the modern world gained a more thorough comprehension of the scholastics, the teachers of the Church in that period. We have grown more intimate with the men who proposed to themselves the huge task of working up the teachings of the Fathers, and of constructing out of that material those gigantic doctrinal systems, which have often enough been compared with the domes of the same period. But you must not look for these Church-teachers merely in the hoary cells of the

\* Originally delivered before the Professorverein at the University of Leipsic.

monks, in dark sacristies, in dismal laboratories and lecture-rooms. The Abbot of Clairvaux called by his eloquence all the western nations to the Holy Sepulchre. And whenever persons at this day seek refuge from the turmoil of the streets of Paris, by repairing to the quiet heights of the Pere la Chaise, whose monuments contain so many brilliant names, they love to seek the one ingeniously constructed out of mediæval church ruins over the remains of Abelard and Heloise. There we will tarry to-day.

Fortunately we know the life of Abelard up to his residence in the convent of St. Gildas from an autobiography, which forms part of a letter of consolation written to an afflicted friend.

Abelard, born 1079 at Palais, not far from Nantes in Brittany, was the oldest son of a knight of that country, who cherished a love for science and a deep religious feeling, that afterwards drew him into a cloister. Abelard early felt that he would not attain knighthood in the exercise of arms, but in the warfare of dialectics. His father saw it and allowed him to have his own way. In knightly style he went forth adventurously after knowledge. The seats of learning in those days were the convent-schools, in which was taught what is now divided between the university and the lower schools. The great Anselm of Canterbury taught, in the monastery of Bec in Normandy, the elements of Latin, as well as the profoundest truths in theology. The time had now come, when these convent-schools were to develop into universities. In Paris William of Champaux, who had derived from Anselm of Canterbury more his warmth than his depth and clearness, was giving instruction in dialectics in a free way to a circle of disciples. To him came Abelard, heard him, found himself not satisfied and even dared to contradict his master. The relations of teacher and pupil at that time were so free, intimate and unregulated, that the teachers were no less dependent upon the pupils than the pupils were upon the teachers. In these dialectic disputes with his teacher Abelard found out that he,



too, could give instruction, and indeed, as he thought, better than William of Champeaux. Full of youthful self-confidence, he began to teach at Melun, where at that time the court generally resided; afterwards he went to Corbeil, which is still nearer Paris. The zeal, with which he studied, brought him for a time upon a bed of sickness. On his return from home in restored health he again taught with renewed power, in the face of which William became daily less able to sustain himself. The bold young logician obliged his master to change his theory on the conception of species (*die Lehre über die Gattungsbegriffe*). All William's efforts to check the victorious career of his opponent, proved in vain. Abelard, however, felt that his reputation as a teacher of dialectics would be increased by his becoming a theologian. He hastened to sit at the feet of Anselm of Laon, who enjoyed great reputation as a teacher of theology. But in his lecture-room the daring, restless, self-conscious youth saw only smoke, no fire, an endless number of leaves, but no fruit. He thought he could lecture equally well. They kept him to his word. And on the following day he delivered a lecture on one of the most difficult passages in Ezekiel, which won him no small measure of applause. These lectures he continued. As a matter of course, the pupils and admirers of Anselm of Laon, among whom Alberich and Lotulf deserve special mention, took great offence; and Anselm declared it a duty, which he owed to pure doctrine, to banish this uncalled teacher from his auditorium. Hence Abelard returned to Paris, where he achieved the most splendid success. Upon the rostrum he was the chivalrous youth, who lectured not as if he was rehearsing from memory, but as one who produces while he utters, expressing his thoughts in clear, beautiful language, and wielding them as if ever ready for a fight. It was not merely his learning but also his personality, that carried along his hearers with irresistible power. Even the Parisian ladies loved to hear of the talented, noble-spirited young man, who was possessed of a handsome appearance and simple manners, and was able not merely to converse well, but also to sing

and write verses. Abelard, however, had no room in his heart for any interests except those of science.

Here he became acquainted with Heloise, the niece of the prebendary Fulbert in Paris. This Fulbert was a very narrow-minded man, who pursued with great tenacity the few ideas and aims which he cherished. His money and his niece were the two possessions, which he valued above everything else. She was reared in the cloister of Argenteuil, not far from Paris. She was a woman of extraordinary beauty, of a fiery disposition, possessed of much talent and great acquirements, not only acquainted with Latin but (what can be said of few theologians of that day) also somewhat familiar with Greek and Hebrew. Everywhere people talked of this wonderful woman. When Abelard saw her, he fell passionately in love with her. To love her was now his only idea. But how could he come into her presence? To the uncle, who basked in the sunlight streaming from his famous niece without losing sight of the glitter of gold, it was not difficult for Abelard to make it clear that by taking into his home some scholar like himself, who did not care to be bothered with household duties, the scholar would willingly, during his leisure hours, give Heloise instruction in science. To adorn his house with two stars at less expense, thought Fulbert, would be impossible. Inasmuch as persons of narrow views judge everything according to their own preconceived notions, he could not conceive how a self-denying scholar and an inquisitive niece could enter into closer connections than those of master and disciple. About the matter and manner of instruction he gave himself no further concern. But from his own hard experience he had taken the notion that instruction could not take hold of the pupil without corporal punishment, and hence gave permission to make use of this means of culture. Soon, however, there went forth from Abelard songs of the most glowing love, adapted to the most enchanting melodies, which all celebrated one Heloise; and these made their way among the people, where they were echoed and re-echoed long after the spring-time of this love had passed

away. Many ladies—this at least was the subsequent confession of Heloise—envied the one whom the much-sought Abelard celebrated in such strains. But his pupils saw the matter in a different light. His method of teaching into which his personality entered as a very prominent factor, could not but betray what had occurred within him. In a distracted, mechanical, lifeless style, he taught what he remembered, without exercising that fervid power of original thought, which had drawn to him his pupils. The cause of it could not remain concealed. Fulbert was informed. He declared the thing an impossibility. But the reality was more powerful than his notions. As soon as he had convinced himself that love, not science, was the topic of conversation between Abelard and Heloise, he separated them in the greatest wrath. But this separation only brought them nearer together. Abelard finally knew of no expedient except elopement. He brought Heloise to his home in Bretany. There indeed they were both secure from the immediate consequences of Fulbert's rage. What was, however, to be the final result? The means ordained by God to give this passionate love the character of morality, was marriage. The one, who was emphatically opposed to this step, was not Abelard but Heloise. Her love for him was not free from sensuous desires and from ambitious admiration; but in her innermost soul she loved his personality with such a noble, unselfish love, with such a power of self-denial and such a high appreciation of his spiritual calling, that she did not wish to be his wife but only his beloved. In her opinion a man with the calling of an Abelard ought not to marry. The sages of antiquity and the Christian Fathers were unanimous in maintaining that pupils and domestics, ink-stands and cradles, the pen and the distaff do not suit together. The little cares of life in which she would entangle him, would only hinder his career. She did not wish to have it said of herself that she dragged his lofty spirit into the dust. If he would only love her, more she did not desire. She would rather be his courtesan than his wife. As she only loved his personality, she desired from him

only personal love. Abelard knew of no means other than marriage by which to avert the wrath of Fulbert. The latter seemed reconciled when Abelard proposed this to him. They were married in the presence of the uncle at matins. But Abelard, who it seems had taken this step more from external than internal reasons, was anxious to keep the matter secret. And Heloise could at times assert in the strongest terms that she was not his wife. He brought her for a time into the convent of Argenteuil, where she wore the apparel of a nun. Thither he secretly came from time to time. Thereupon Fulbert became convinced that Abelard was trying to make her a nun in order to get rid of her in that way. And now he brooded revenge. He found an opportunity in connection with a faithless servant of Abelard. The two surprised him in his sleep and made him an eunuch. It was the end of this brief marriage.

Abelard ordered Heloise to take the veil in Argenteuil; he himself went into the monastery of St. Denis, near Paris. Convents of that day were no places, in which the broken heart could find peace in God. The writings of Bernhard of Clairvaux, the great contemporary of Abelard, contain a description in strong terms of the corruption of monastic life in his period. "The Abbots," says he, "resemble the knights in the castles. Lately I saw one with a retinue of sixty horses. When making a journey of several hours, they take tapestry, beds, lamps, and ware enough for a court. The monks run about in every market-place, trade in every store, and dress like sportsmen. Of simple diet they wish to know nothing. They assert that lentils lie heavy upon the stomach, that cole causes melancholy, that water is injurious to the breast and milk to the head. It is incredible what they on fast-days beat up, bake and make out of fish and eggs. Paul advised Timothy to take a little wine for his stomach's sake. These not only drink large quantities, but also examine carefully whether the wine is nice and mellow. Instead of watching and praying they snore by night and whine by day. When they come together, they do not carry on earnest conversation, but tickle the ear with ambiguous language,

and engage in buffoonery." Such was the state of things at St. Denis. The king not unwillingly beheld this dissolute life, because he expected to reap a harvest upon the ruins of monasticism. Abelard was no saint; but the passion, which had drawn him aside from the paths of earnest effort, had died away. He felt himself impelled to bear testimony against this dissoluteness. Earnest divines in Paris had asked him to teach no longer for money and honor but for God's sake. He did so, and from the seed he now sowed sprang up for him a sad harvest of affliction. His fundamental principle he propounded in his "Introduction to Theology." Undoubtedly in this book there reigned a more liberal spirit that sought to harmonize the doctrines of the Church with the laws and results of dialectics. He tried by all kinds of analogies to explain the mystery of the Trinity. He reminded his disciples of the three persons in grammar, of the seal in which the signet, the impression and the act of sealing are distinguished; that Father, Son and Holy Spirit are related in the same manner as might, wisdom and goodness, etc. In this attempt the age saw only a presumptuous endeavor to clear up the mysteries of faith. At the Synod of Soissons (1121) an accusation was brought against him. To the malevolence of the accusers was added the fanaticism of the people who almost stoned Abelard without knowing what was under consideration. Two of his fellow-students from the time when he listened, or rather did not listen, to Anselm of Laon, Alberich and Lotulf, stirred up everything against him. The papal legate, who was to decide as the highest court of appeal, understood not the least thing about the transaction. In vain did the mild and noble Bishop of Chartres bear testimony in his behalf. Abelard was obliged to throw his "Introduction" into the fire and to profess aloud the Creed of Athanasius. In addition he was doomed to confinement in the convent of St. Medardus. Being soon afterwards liberated, he returned to the convent of St. Denis. This is named after Dionysius, reputed as the first Bishop of Paris and honored as the protector of France. In the effort to impart as much lustre

•

as possible to this patron-saint, they brought him into connection with the Dionysius, who received the Apostle Paul into his house when the latter spoke upon the Areopagus at Athens. Dionysius, the Areopagite, was regarded as the author of certain mystical writings, which were composed five hundred years later. A clear intellect like Abelard's soon perceived that Dionysius, the first Bishop of Paris, could have no connection with Dionysius, the Areopagite; and he could appeal to the assertion of a recognized Church-father, Beda Venerabilis. This assertion excited the convent to the uttermost. People saw in him not only an enemy of the convent but of the kingdom, and were on the point of arming the king against him. Flight alone was left for Abelard. He took refuge in the neighboring territory of Diebold of Champagne, who offered him his protection. There he lived quietly in the monastery of Provins. There one day the Abbot of St. Denis found the fugitive. Little as he cared for Abelard personally, he nevertheless cared very much for the fame which Abelard's name gave to the convent. He wished him back by all means. Fortunately the abbot soon died; and the King of France, who did not wish Abelard's residence in the convent because his moral earnestness might have delayed the expected dissolution of the convent, gave him permission to lead his life of self-denial anywhere except under another abbot.

Abelard retired into the region of Rogent, which lies solitary and dotted with many forests upon the banks of the Seine in the territory of Troyes. There he built a house upon a stream overshadowed by lofty oaks. Soon pupils gathered themselves around him from all quarters. They built themselves tents and huts, lived on the fruits of the field, while they furnished their teacher with food, clothing, and whatever else his daily wants required. They built for him a house out of stone, which he dedicated to the Paraclete, to the Holy Ghost as the Comforter. For he found comfort in this solitude enlivened by science. The many pupils who had left castles and cities and had given up all the conveniences of life for the sake of

learning from him, were to him an elevating and encouraging spectacle. In this free communion between teacher and pupils, we see the natural basis of university life. But this wilderness did not protect him against the powerful tendency, which at the start had manifested itself against his theology. And this tendency was not headed by such insignificant people as Alberich and Lotulf, but by two mighty chieftains of monasticism; viz, Norbert, Father of the Præmonstrants, and Bernhard, the great Abbot of Clairvaux. Abelard did not hear of an assembly of the clergy without the fear of being condemned by them. Hence it was not contrary to his wishes, when he received a call as Abbot of St. Gildas.

There on the distant strand of Bretany upon a rocky precipice, which breaks the foaming surges of the Atlantic, he seemed to be safe from the assaults of his enemies. Soon he was forced to blame himself for having left the abode of the Paraclete to plunge himself into ceaseless dangers. This convent was situated in a country whose inhabitants were regarded as barbarians by the inhabitants of the central portions of France. The landed possessions of the convent, from which the monks were to live, had fallen into the hands of a knight, who managed and ruled over them with despotic sway. The monks, who did not know whereon to live, were constantly in a disorganized state. They were monks, who had wives and children to support. And this was not their worst trait. They were a band of villains, who did not wish to submit to any discipline. When now Abelard made earnest with them, they not only threw all possible difficulties in his way, but constantly sought his life. They hired criminals to murder him on his journeys, poisoned his sacramental wine, managed even to get poison into the house of his brother, with whom he lived a short time, so that a lay brother, who had accompanied Abelard, fell down dead from the effects. Besides by the fall of his horse on the journey he broke one of the bones of his neck. And when he heard, in his university situated way off in the wilderness, of the ceaseless attacks of his enemies, he longed



for a dwelling-place among the heathen, of whom he expected that they would at least not disturb his peace. He now longed for the eternal rest. His heart was broken; the strength of his youth was gone; without were fightings and fears within; what could the earth yet give him. In this mood he wrote to a friend, with whom he had lived, giving him a history of his sufferings. But the hand of eternal love still had in reserve for him one source of consolation. Heloise was still among the living.

Heloise, as we saw, had gone into the convent of Argenteuil. What had influenced her to take this step, was solely Abelard's will. So powerful was her love for him, that she willingly accepted the bitterest fate, which could be prepared for her love. "Into such a frenzy has my love been transformed that it removed from itself its only object of desire without the hope of ever regaining the same, inasmuch I immediately upon your command changed my mind as well as my apparel so that I might show you to be sole lord of my love and my soul." Not love to God but love for Abelard had brought her into the convent. She did not there seek and find the place, which the cloister has furnished to so many broken hearts. She could not without bitterness think of the hand which had so cruelly torn from her the only object of her heart. She saw no love, no justice, in the guidance of her life. Between her and Abelard lay a ban, which no earthly hand could remove; and yet her heart still beat with the most ardent love. Her phantasy lived upon the hours of the past. Even to the mass did thoughts of love accompany her. Without wishing it she stood in the dress of a nun with the air of one, whose lips overflow with love. She could and would not throw into the sacrificial flames of a convent her glowing heart, her blessed memories, this ever-blooming world that was constantly reproduced in her imagination. How difficult it must have been for her to endure the self-denial of a kind of life whose rewards she did not covet. She did not long for the crown, which according to the belief of the age was furnished to those living in a convent. She

only wished to be saved, not crowned. "I do not seek the crown of victory, it is enough for me to be out of danger. Into whatever corner of heaven the Lord puts me, there I shall be satisfied." In such inner tempests she spent her days in the convent of Argenteuil. She never saw him. Not so much as a word by letter ever reached her.

The worldly spirit of the monastery of St. Denis, which had banished Abelard, also broke in upon Heloise. The abbot of this monastery seized Argenteuil and banished the nuns. Abelard on hearing of it offered Heloise the house which he had dedicated to the Paraclete. This was indeed a house; but where were nourishment and protection to be obtained in so wild and dangerous a locality? The respect, which at that time was paid in France to pious women, procured for this convent far more sympathy and protection than Abelard could have offered. There went forth from Heloise a spirit of love to God, of gentle humility, of eminent wisdom, which won many hearts for her and her convent. And how must Abelard have felt as he came out of the den of murderers in Gildas to the house of comfort, where his own Heloise now reigned as abbess. He put up there from time to time, but with great caution and reserve as became a spiritual father. He wrote no letters to Heloise. Into her hands now fell a history of the sufferings of Abelard, which spoke so much of Heloise. She wrote him a letter, which was headed: "To her lord, yea father, to her husband, yea brother, from his maid-servant, yea daughter, from his wife, yea sister." Now there began a correspondence, which continued until the last days of Abelard. The first two letters of Heloise breathe an ardor of love and depth of sorrow, which engage with irresistible power the sympathy of the heart. Abelard confesses to her that he loves her alone, but differently from what he once did; and by calmness and instruction he endeavored to soften her passionate tone and to give their relation more of a spiritual and religious character. In the third letter Heloise succeeds in controlling her deeply-humbled soul, and now she simply directs to him questions and requests.

Abelard entered upon these with a devotedness, which can only be explained on the supposition of the most cordial love. He discussed the origin of the order of nuns, gave the nuns in the Paraclete a rule, composed religious addresses and poems for them and answered difficult questions, which Heloise had proposed to him. Heloise's letters, it must be confessed, are more charming than those of Abelard. For this there is a deep cause. Both Abelard and Heloise were restless, passionate, truly romantic natures; with all their sensuous ardor they were spiritual personalities; they were true, cordial, one might almost say protestant characters, who laid all stress upon the inner disposition, not upon external works; and only expected to find and have the truth in development and effort. But in spite of the agitated life which breathes through their letters, the thoughts and feelings of Heloise are from the beginning more harmonious than those of Abelard. Her nature is richer, stronger, better grounded and possessed of more character than that of Abelard. Although she had more to lose than Abelard, yet she is capable of much more sacrificing devotion. One can not help admiring this truly noble woman, who united such extraordinary talent with such humility and childlike obedience, who combined with her ideal love such truthfulness that she is not afraid to open up to view the innermost recesses of her heart, and with a lofty flight of thought, also a natural vigor and originality of her entire being. With the same love of the truth, with which he describes the feelings of her heart, she also gives utterance to the doubts which single passages of Scripture awakened in her; and it must be confessed that her questions to Abelard are much more profound than his answers. The bold dissonances which she strikes in her first letters, promise, and indeed demand, a so much deeper and fuller harmony at last, if not in this world, at least in the next. We may perhaps say that the relation between Abelard and Heloise contained a glorified element, which was but a prophecy of the world to come. Abelard raises not a word of complaint against God. He sees in his mutilation as well as in his condemna-

tion a deserved judgment, a healing source of discipline. He directs Heloise away from himself to Christ as the true bridegroom of the soul.

After all the means for reforming the monastery of St. Gildas had been exhausted, Abelard left it for the purpose of again teaching, as in his earlier days, upon the mount of St. Geneveva. But now the severest storm of his life gathered over his head. The complaints against his theology became louder and louder. His most decided and most important opponent was Bernhard of Clairvaux. In the great beginnings of the medieval scholasticism Anselm of Canterbury united in a most wonderful manner thorough dialectic treatment of the articles of faith with profound subjectivity (*gründlicher Verinnerlichung*). These two tendencies now ran counter to each other. Abelard was preëminently the theologian of dialectics, Bernhard the theologian of the heart. And as things develop upon this earth, the representatives of these two great tendencies could not but repel each other. Abelard saw too much warmth in Bernhard, and Bernhard too much light in Abelard. Hear what the former says against the latter. "Abelard wishes to comprehend everything and to see nothing in a mirror. He is only willing to believe what he understands. Boys who have scarcely learned the elements of the faith, reason upon the streets in regard to the Trinity. They despise the faith of the laity and sneer at the authority of the fathers. Abelard speaks of the Trinity like Arius, of grace like Pelagius, of Christ's Person like Nestorius. His books are carried about to the joy of all who hate the light. The man is great in his own eyes and extends his sprouts to the sea and his branches to Rome. For the people a new gospel is prepared, a new faith is invented, another foundation is laid than that which has been laid. He is a Goliath, who despises the hosts of Israel, a Herod with the outward appearance of a John, a Peter the Dragon, that has pounced upon Peter the Lion." These and other things spoke Bernhard.

An unprejudiced person will perceive from the tone, that

there is here rhetorical exaggeration. Bernhard constantly throws Abelard and his pupils together, just as if a teacher could be held responsible for all the excesses of his pupils. In his last letter to Heloise, Abelard in a very decided manner accepts the old Catholic creed in regard to Father, Son and Holy Ghost, at the same time renouncing all heresies, which the ancient Church had condemned. By nature a philosopher, he could not help proposing to himself the task of a logical reproduction of the faith of the Church so as to bring it nearer to the philosophic understanding. The entire scholasticism of the middle ages made the same effort. Bernhard of Clairvaux, who was no thinker, had no conception of this perfectly justifiable mental exertion with all its temptations, struggles, and dangers. He clung to the traditional faith of the Church, which as such had for him divine authority, and he found the proof of its truth in the inner experiences of the Christian's soul. Abelard, too, acknowledged the authority of the teachings of the Church, and only slander could say of him that he was without Christian experience. He who confesses his sins, humbles himself beneath the powerful hand of God, and points to Christ in the way in which Abelard did in his letters to Heloise, is not merely a Christian in name but in deed and in truth. The judgment which Bernhard allowed himself to pass upon the spiritual condition of this sorely-tried man, I can only call presumptuous and slanderous. He who seeks to bring his faith into harmony with the science that seeks after truth, should, it is true, guard against the danger of desiring to explain the mysteries of faith and to clear them up in rationalistic style. Nevertheless an effort to gain clearness, unity and certitude lies in the nature of all science. I do not deny that Abelard was more clear than profound, that humanism and Christianity are not properly mediated, that he did not recognize sin in all its depth, nor the healing power of Christianity in all its fullness, that in him there was a certain one-sided doctrinalism, which made him find in Christ principally a witness of the truth. But whoever takes a view of Abelard's

life, clearly perceives the training hand of God, which constantly aimed to make him poor and humble in order that Christ might be manifested in him with more glory and power.

To this school also belongs the last stroke which was prepared for him mainly by Bernhard, at the Synod of Sens (1140). We will not detain ourselves with the history of the same in its particulars. Bernhard conquered by the plerophory of his testimony, by the gravitating force of the masses, who always mistrust progressive men, and through the decision of a Pope, who was partially informed and not master of the situation. A pupil of Abelard has given a picture of the Synod, which is somewhat pert but in its particulars not untrue. He relates how during the reading of the passages, that were accused in Abelard's writings, the bishops sat engaged in the business of digestion; and when the louder tones of the reader disturbed their sleep at particularly doubtful passages, they broke out in a loud *damnamus* (we condemn), which others imitated in the last two syllables, *namus* (we swim). The sentence of the Pope was excommunication, the burning of his writings and confinement in a monastery. Abelard hoped in Rome to exert an influence upon the Pope. His journey led him to the convent of Clugny, whose abbot, Peter, fully deserved the surname of venerable, which posterity has given. He offered a resting-place to the monk, who had grown weary of life, having passed his sixtieth year. Peter the Venerable wrote to the Pope that he should grant to the man, whose days were perhaps not many more, a respite in Clugny, where his talent for teaching could be employed in the service of the Church. The Pope consented. Through the mediation of the Abbot of Cîteaux a reconciliation took place between Abelard and Bernhard. Abelard wrote certain philosophic essays, taught and gave good counsel when he was asked. In other respects he was quiet; he read much, ate little, wore plain garments, refused every kind of honor, prayed without ceasing and delighted to attend mass. Peter the Venerable who wrote an account of this to Heloise, could not remember having ever

seen a more humble man. God, who, to use the language of Scripture, had trained him as a father trains his child, had accomplished His work. The daring, ambitious, passionate, arrogant heart had been humbled by God and in God. For the purpose of recreation Peter the Venerable induced him to go to St. Marcell near Chalons, one of the most beautiful localities in Burgundy. There he felt that his end was at hand. He made a confession of his sins, received the sacrament and died in peace. He had cherished the wish to be buried in the convent of his Heloise. Peter the Venerable himself brought his remains thither. Because Heloise wished it, Peter the Venerable declared in writing that he by virtue of his office had absolved Abelard from all his sins in the name of the Triune God. Heloise lived twenty-one years longer. Then death came. In accordance with her wishes her remains were laid in the coffin of Abelard. Thus rested their bodies until the storms of the French revolution disturbed their quiet. Paraclete was destroyed in 1792. Their remains came under Lucien Bonaparte into the museum of the French monuments in Paris. The leaden coffin was opened and the corpses were well-nigh preserved. The countenance of Heloise still bore traces of its former beauty. Since 1816 they rest upon the Pere la Chaise, where many visit the grave.

---

The following beautiful poem, which has come down from the Middle Ages, may close this sketch:

NONALIU ET HELOISÆ  
NÆNIA  
JUXTA SEPULCRUM  
ABELARDI.

---

1.

NONALES.

Requiescat a labore  
Doloroso, et amore!  
Unionem cœlitum



Flagitavit :  
Jam intravit  
Salvatoris adytum.

## 2.

In obscura tumbæ cella  
Alma micat justo stella :  
Instar ipse siderum  
Refulgebit,  
Dum videbit  
In fulgore nominum.

## 3.

## HELOISA :

Salve victor sub corona,  
Sponse in nitente cona !  
Millibus cum lacrymis  
Quem salutat  
Tua mutat  
Vidua in tenebris.

## 4.

In æterna mihi junctum  
Amo dignior defunctum  
Beatorum socium :  
Mars piavit,  
Qui sanavit  
Insanatum animum.

## 5.

Tecum fata sum perpessa ;  
Tecum dormiam defessa  
Et in Sion veniam :  
Salve crucem  
Duc ad lucem  
Degravatam animam !

## 6.

Sanitæ animæ, faveta !  
Consolare, paraclete !  
Audin ? sonat gaudia !

Cantilena  
Et amœna  
Angulorum cythara.

7.

NONALES :

Requiescant a labore  
Doloroso et amore !  
Unionem cœlitum.  
Flagitabant.  
Jam intrabant  
Salvatoris adytum.

---

ART. V.—WONDERS OF THE BIBLE.

WE use the term *wonders* here in the same sense, as when it is used in a different connection. We speak, for instance, of the Wonders of Nature ; meaning, thereby, objects of nature which fill us with surprise, or excite our admiration. That there are such natural wonders, we all know. Volumes are written upon them and eagerly read ; and money is lavishly spent in order to see them. We need not, indeed, go far to see them. They surround our very doors, and crowd upon us at every step, wherever we may go. To us the process of vegetation and of the growth of plants is a standing wonder. That force or power in the plant, a power or force which is subtle, intangible, imponderable ; which cannot be described except by the results which it accomplishes ; which takes up the dead elements from the soil and changes them into life, and converts them into food suitable for man and beast ; is indeed something admirable. Go to the nearest drug store, and buy all the chemicals which enter into the composition of wheat : mix them up carefully and according to the latest principles and recognized laws of science ; and see whether you will get flour fit to make bread for man.

One of the wonders of the Bible seems to us to be its science, and its general harmony with the teachings of secular Science. It is true, the world has ever been busy, and seems especially busy now, in seeking divergencies between the Bible and Science. And if we are from the very start determined to find divergencies, our search will probably not be unsuccessful. And yet the wonder is not so much that apparent divergencies can be found—for after all both science and biblical interpretation have not yet reached perfection—but that the general harmony is so complete.

But when we speak of the science of the Bible, we do not thereby mean to assert, that the Bible gives any particular system of science. This would evidently be out of place in a book, the object of which is, to give a history of religion, or of the Kingdom of God. In being this, the Bible had to be, first of all, a popular book, or a book adapted to the comprehension of the people. Suppose the Bible had been a complete system of science, a complete systematic encyclopedia of all that is known and knowable, of all the isms and ologies which now obtain, and may obtain hereafter; to say nothing of the immense bulk of such a work, how could man in his infancy, and even now, understand the learned terms in which scientists delight to express the results of their investigations? One man out of a hundred thousand may understand these: all the rest will require just that language in which the Bible expresses its truths.

What then we mean by the Science of the Bible is simply this: that the Bible in its incidental utterances of great cosmical principles and truths, is always abreast of, and in advance of the particular phase which any science may assume in any particular age.

Science is changing all the time: but as long as it does not directly contradict the theistic principle of the Bible, believers in the latter may adopt any phase, which science may assume at any time. Its utterances are so broad and general, that it may embrace, with the single exception mentioned, all the changes and revolutions of the sciences.

Augustine \* seems to have fully understood this. In speaking in his *Confessions* of the Mosaic account of the creation, he says that "his confessions would not be the humble confessions he desires them to be, were he not to confess that as regards many of those questions, he does not understand the sense in which Moses wrote." All the more does he admire his words, "so sublime in their humility, so rich in their reserve." Then follows, what the Duke of Argyll calls "one of the most remarkable passages ever written by Theologian or Philosopher." "For myself I declare boldly, and from the bottom of my heart, that if I were called to write something which was to be invested with supreme authority, I should desire most so to write, that my words should include the widest range of meaning, and should not be confined to one sense alone, exclusive of all others, even of some which should be inconsistent with my own. Far from me, O God, be the temerity to suppose that so great a Prophet did not receive from Thy Grace even such a favor! Yes; he had in view and in his spirit, when he traced these words, all that we can ever discover of the truth—even every truth which has escaped us hitherto, or which escapes us still, but which nevertheless may yet be discovered in them."

Applying all this, let us first turn to the science of Astronomy. There was a time when the geocentric system of the universe was universally accepted and taught. It was the system accepted by scientists, or scholars, if you please, as well as by priests and parsons. And indeed it is quite natural that this should be so. It does look very much as if the earth stood still, and as if the sun, moon and stars revolved around it. We do see the sun rising in the East, crossing the meridian, and setting in the West. This is the view taken of things from the beginning, and, in spite of modern scientific corrections, will likely be the popular view and way of representing things to the end. The Bible certainly does not contradict this geocentric theory. Its incidental

\* As quoted by the Duke of Argyll, in "*Primeval Man*," pp. 34-35.

allusions and illustrations drawn from the universe chime in with it. Indeed, the authors of the books of the Bible could do no otherwise. For, even if they had held the heliocentric theory, in addressing themselves to the human race as they found it, they had to speak and write so as to be intelligible. If they had embodied the heliocentric theory in their religious teachings, the former would have been a complete bar to the latter. And yet the Bible commits itself neither to one theory nor the other. It does not teach a system of astronomic science. And yet it is fully abreast even of this. For who now, even of those who deny the divine origin of the Bible, would derive an argument against it from the fact, that in its allusions and illustrations it views the universe geocentrically, rather than heliocentrically. All intelligent Christians now admit that the sun stands still, and that the earth revolves around it : but this does not in the least interfere with their faith in the Bible, as the Word of God.

In spite of the assertion often made, that the Mosaic record of creation and the geological record can never be reconciled, it is a matter of constant wonder to us, that these two records agree so well. And not only this ; but, moreover, that we have in the Bible the only account of the origin of the world, which at all agrees with the record deciphered from the rocks. Take a few of the traditional cosmogonies of the ancients by way of example. \* “The cosmogony of the Babylonians represents the beginning of things as in darkness and water, when nondescript animals, hideous monsters, *half-men* and half-beasts, appeared and after this, a woman—who personates the creative spirit or principle—was split into two parts, and the heaven and the earth produced by the division. Then Belus, the supreme divinity, cut off his own head, and his blood trickling down, and mingling with the dust of the earth, produced human creatures having intelligence and spiritual life. According to the Phœnician cosmogony, that which first appeared was an ether or a mist

\* See Thompson, *Man in Genesis and in Geology*.

diffused in space. Then arose the wind, the representative of motion, and from this agitation proceeded a spiritual God, from whom again in turn proceeded an egg, the division of which produced the heavens and the earth. The Egyptian cosmogony was in general harmony with the Phœnician.\*

"The Egyptians, according to Plato, fancied that the heavens and earth originated in a promiscuous pulp. From this the elements separated of their own accord; fire sprang from the upper regions; the air began to move. The warmth of the sun bred living creatures innumerable in the plastic mud, and these, according to the predominance of the various elements, betook themselves to the air, the water, or the solid land. Man was generated from the slime of the river Nile."\*

"According to the Hindoo cosmogony the 'First Sole Cause thinks within himself, I will create worlds.' Water is then brought into being, over the surface of which moves Brahma, the Creator. Brahma first effects the emergence of the land from the waters, and the creation of the firmament. He then vivifies the earth, in succession, with plants, animals, celestial creatures, and man. The sun springs from his eye, the from his ear, the fire from his mouth. From his mouth, his arm, his thigh, his foot, proceed the founders of the chief Hindoo castes."†

Any one, having only a general acquaintance with the subject, will see at once that these cosmogonies cannot be made to agree with the results of modern science. They are fabulous, mere speculations sundered from sober facts. Although here and there may be rays of truth gleaming through fabulous absurdities, yet the whole tenor of them is at variance with that which we now know. When we turn to the Mosaic account of creation, we find all quite different; and our constant wonder is, that everything should agree so well. We do not, indeed, hereby wish to assert, that the Mosaic account in every particu-

\* Prof. A. Winchell, LL.D., in *Sketches of Creation*, p. 382.

† The same, p. 383.

lar anticipates the conclusions of geology. This would evidently be out of place in a book, which teaches us not that which we can discover by the exercise of our mental faculties, but only that which is above these faculties, and therefore not to be reached by them. But we do assert, that the *general process of creation*, as given in the first chapter of Genesis, is the same process as that which has been discovered by science. This coincidence is to us truly wonderful; and especially when we take into consideration the age in which Moses lived and wrote. Although "Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," yet Geology was not included in the cycle of Egyptian science. What he learned from the Egyptian sages with regard to the origin of the world, we have seen above. What a wonderful difference between what he learned, and what he taught! What he learned, has been discarded long ago, and belongs to the lumber of past ages: what he has taught us, has stood the test of every age up to the present time. For, although this Mosaic record has often been partially or wholly eclipsed, when either new discoveries in science were made, which however were not yet perfectly understood, or scriptural interpretation and theology did not keep pace with these discoveries, yet with riper understanding on both sides, it has always emerged from the shadow with new lustre.

It cannot lie within the scope of this article to enter into the details of the harmony between the Bible and Science. This is not our theme. We wish simply to point to some things which seem to us to be wonderful in the Bible—a prophecy not merely of the kingdom of religion, but even of the kingdom of science. In Genesis i. 3: "God said, Let there be light, and there was light." Until more recently this has been a standing offence to skeptics. The question, "How can there be light, before there were lights," was thought to finish Moses and his account of the creation for all times. But science itself has now vindicated the truth of Moses. For since the adoption of the nebular hypothesis almost universally by scientists, the account stands: light first, and lights afterwards.



Prof. James D. Dana, in giving in his *Geology*, p. 742, a statement of the stages of progress in creation, says:

"1. *The Beginning of Activity, in Matter.* In such a beginning from matter in the state of a gaseous fluid the activity would be intense, and it would show itself at once by a manifestation of light, since light is a resultant of molecular activity. A flash of light through the universe would therefore be the first announcement of the work begun." Now look at this a moment. Here is this man Moses, thousands of years before there was any science—any true physical science, at least—giving, whether by a divine intuition, or by a divinely guided retrospective vision, or taught by a tradition started in a direct communication from God to a chosen line of patriarchs, and faithfully kept by them, a statement contradicting all experience, and calculated to draw upon itself sneers of derision; and yet, after mind unguided by revelation has struggled for thousands of years, it has brought us to this simple conclusion at last: Light first, and lights afterwards. This is to us a standing wonder.

Take another point in this Mosaic record. In Gen. i. 24-26, it is said: "And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping things, and beasts of the earth after his kind, and it was so. And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good. And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Here are several things to be considered. First, the Mosaic account gives the creation of man as the last creative act. "On the seventh day God ended his work which he had made;" and He "rested on the seventh day from all His work which he had made." Now all the researches and discoveries of science teach one thing positively, viz: that man was the last to appear upon the earth. Even since the human historic period, there have been extinctions of various species of animals, but there have been no new creations: no new species have made their appearance. Although under domestication, that is, under the guidance of mind, certain species

of animals may have become very much improved in form and better adapted to certain purposes of man ; yet horses, kine, sheep and swine are specifically the same animals which they ever were. Man remains the last of created beings.

There is another thing to be noted here. All who are to any extent acquainted with the subject, know that geologists have divided the history of the earth into certain periods, generally by some prevailing organic peculiarity. Thus we have successively the age of mollusks, of fishes, of plants, of reptiles, of mammals, and of man. It was at first supposed that the age of mammals had come to an end, before the age of man began. Later discoveries have led scientists to a different conclusion. From the fact that the remains of man, such as human bones, or the works of the earliest human art, have been found in connection with the remains of the mammalian age, it is generally supposed now that the age of mammals and the age of man overlap and run into each other : that is, that man for some time coexisted with those huge, uncouth mammals, which have long since become extinct, and of which the historic age of man knows nothing, except by its fossil remains. This, now, seems to us remarkably to confirm the Mosaic record. The work of creation on the sixth day was essentially first the creation of mammals, and finally the creation of man. Here again the Mosaic account has anticipated science. By the former, mammals and man are brought into as close proximity as by the latter. But now how comes this ? Moses was certainly no geologist. The wisdom of Egypt was certainly no safe guide to him in these points. And yet even in this particular how wonderfully he has anticipated thousands of years of laborious research.

We may perhaps be permitted in this connection to refer to a third point of this part of the Mosaic record. "And God said, *Let the earth bring forth* the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping things, and beasts of the earth after his kind : and it was so." And before this : "And God said, *Let the earth bring forth* grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the

earth : and it was so. And the *earth brought forth* grass, and the herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind." There is at the present time, and has perhaps been during all ages, a class of physicists, who wish to derive every thing that exists from matter. With them matter has embraced from the beginning the possibilities of all things, that have ever come to exist. Nature is the great mother of all and everything. Of course, this we regard as untenable. It is to us utterly unthinkable, that that which is in itself dead, should produce life ; that the inorganic should by its own inherent power or force, produce the organic. For, after all, the history of life seems to be a constant struggle ; life, on its side, struggling to master that which is dead, and to lift it up into its own higher sphere ; and, on the other side, matter struggling against life, and striving to return again to its own original condition ; a struggle, which is ended for this world in the death of the body. And yet, may not Moses in the words quoted again anticipate a theory of science : making nature, or matter, really the mother of organic existences, not immediately, or independently, but as the means or agency which God used in order to bring living beings into existence. For we can scarcely think that the Creator sat down to make models, and then to change them into life. We think that there is even a phase of materialism, which is in accord not only with science, but also with the Scriptures. And if it is the aim of atheistic materialism, to bring it into conflict with the Bible, let it be the aim of theologians and believers to recognize what is true in it, and show that even here there is in the end no conflict at all.

It was our purpose to continue this line of thought to some other departments of science, and also to some departments of human life in general. But we have already taken up more space than was our purpose. We will be allowed to conclude with another extract from "Primeval Man." "Certain it is," remarks the Duke of Argyll, in connection with the passage already quoted, "that whatever new views may now be taken

of the origin and authorship of the first chapter of Genesis, it stands alone among the traditions of mankind in the wonderful simplicity and grandeur of its words. Specially remarkable—miraculous it really seems to be—is that character of reserve which leaves open to reason all that reason may be able to attain. The meaning of those words seem always to be a meaning ahead of Science—not because it anticipates the results of science, but because it is independent of them, and runs, as it were, round the outer margin of all possible discovery.

---

ART. V.—A SPIRITUAL MIND PREREQUISITE TO RIGHT  
JUDGMENT ON HOLY SCRIPTURE.

---

BY THE REV. E. V. GERHART, D. D.

---

IN order that any one may be qualified to pass an intelligent judgment on the truth of the Bible, or on the question whether the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are in the proper and distinctive sense the Word of God, at least two prerequisites are indispensable. These do not indeed embrace all the necessary conditions; but they involve those elements of personal qualification which for our present purpose it will suffice to emphasize.

One of these prerequisites is a legitimate *standard* of judgment. Every work of genius belongs to a given domain of truth. That particular domain, to the exclusion of all others, furnishes the criterion by which the work is to be estimated. The *Æneid* of Virgil is an epic. The standard by which this classic production must be judged is given, neither by the idea of history, nor natural science, nor philosophy. Belonging to the empire of Art, the *Æneid* can be estimated only by the true idea of the beautiful; not by that idea in general, but by the beautiful as developed and fashioned in the realm of poetry; and in this particular realm the true criterion is given, not by poetry as such, but by the idea of an epic poem. This particu-

lar idea is the touch-stone of its classic excellence. Judged by the conception of the tragedy or the lyric, the *Æneid* is subjected to the scrutiny of a false judgment. It cannot bear the test. Much less can the *Æneid* bear the test of a criterion furnished by any department of truth lying outside of the realm of poetry. That the *Æneid* must be judged, and can be rightly judged, only by the particular idea of an epic poem, is a law of literature which sound criticism accepts and obeys with freedom and confidence.

The same law operates with full force in a criticism of the Bible. As the Bible does not profess to be a work on natural science, (neither on nature as a whole, nor on any single kingdom of the natural world,) neither nature nor any branch of natural science can furnish a legitimate standard of judgment respecting the truth of the Bible. To say the least, the generalizations inferred from natural phenomena are no more a valid criterion of the spiritual truth taught in Holy Scripture than they are a criterion of the classic excellence of the *Æneid*.

The Bible claims to be the Word of God. It claims to record a supernatural revelation in a two-fold dispensation of grace. True, the Bible contains history, and poetry, and philosophy; but it is not essentially a history, or a poem, or a philosophic system. Philosophy, poetry and history are rich elements entering into its exterior structure, but neither one nor all constitute the distinguishing genius of Holy Scripture.

Professing to contain a supernatural revelation, the Bible belongs, not to a natural but to a spiritual domain. It is a spiritual book. Claiming to have been written by men who were moved by the Holy Ghost, the Bible belongs to the kingdom of the Spirit, and must be judged by a spiritual standard. That standard is found in the spiritual Kingdom of Christ as represented in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. Any other standard given by science or philosophy is foreign, and in the nature of the case cannot furnish a criterion of judgment respecting the truth of the Bible, no more than the ideal

of an epic poem can be the test of the value of a work on law or medicine.

The other prerequisite of a valid judgment is a *mind adapted to Holy Scripture by spiritual culture and discipline*. If the Bible be a spiritual book belonging to a spiritual kingdom; if it teach spiritual truth, and must be measured by a spiritual standard; then does the exercise of a sound judgment respecting the truth of the Bible presuppose a spiritual mind in a competent judge. None but a spiritual mind can pass judgment on a spiritual book.

The doctrine of a spiritual mind for a spiritual book, rests upon a general principle that operates in all the relations of actual life. Christianity asserts a law of evidence and a law of judgment that is neither new nor singular, but a law which rules in every department of literature, and which men universally acknowledge.

To perceive an external object implies an organ of perception. The organ must answer to the nature of the object. To the nature of light corresponds the structure of the bodily eye; to sound the structure of the ear. Every sense is nicely adjusted to that part or side of the external world which confronts it. Otherwise there could be no sense-perception. These are simple truisms. All men assume them instinctively.

The same law governs mental perception. As one object differs from another in the material world, so in the immaterial or ethical world truth differs from truth. An axiom in mathematics differs from a fact in history. Both are real. Both are true. To perceive the truth and manifold application of an axiom we need a mathematical eye. To see the significance of a fact of history, like the conversion of Constantine in its relations backward and forward, we need an historical eye. The same person may have both. Or one man may have a sense for the abstract truths of mathematics, but no sense for the significance of epochs in the progress of human history. These differences of mental endowment we call gifts or talents. Hence the spontaneous process of classification prevailing in

the practical affairs of life, and in the sphere of learning and of scholarship. Men naturally arrange themselves in groups agreeably to a common disposition. One man becomes eminent, like Sir Walter Scott, in poetry and romance; but accomplishes nothing in natural science or the mechanic arts. Others, like Guttenberg, Fulton and Morse, become epochs in the department of mechanical invention; whilst in the empire of the beautiful they have no name.

These propositions also are simple truisms. They need but be stated in order to command assent. As there is an endless variety of fact and truth, so there is an endless variety of mind and perception. A few men are born, now and then, at great intervals, whose power of vision adapts them to many departments of knowledge and culture. But the vast majority of men, if they become eminent at all, are bound to one department of truth or fact; and of these the most gain distinction in one branch only of one department; like Rubens in painting the animal kingdom; like Gray by his *Elegy*; Horace by his *Odes* and *Satires*; and Milton by his epic. Men of mark, however make up but a small proportion of our race. The immense mass of people is borne along by the broad current of humanity, leaving behind them no trace of their career. They accomplish no great deeds. They contribute little or nothing to the progress of civilization. Why? Because they do not have the requisite endowments; or if highly endowed, they have not the will to cultivate and apply their powers to good and noble ends.

As between the external natural world and the organs of sense, so between objects in the mental or moral world and the faculties of subjective apprehension, there must be a correlation. All departments of practical life demand, each one, a sort of tact and skill answering to its own kind. So every branch of knowledge presupposes among men a special capacity and a special fitness, or a correspondence between the peculiar capacities of the student and the object of knowledge, like that between the light of the sun and the bodily eye. In all human



relations there is a fitness of things which conditions correct knowledge and sound judgment. Wherever this fitness is wanting the consequence is ignorance, or error and confusion.

The principle is universal ; but nowhere is it applicable with more propriety and force than in the domain of religious truth ; and in this domain applicable to no religion with more propriety than to the religion of Christ. World religions differ indeed very widely ; so widely that a devout pagan, educated in the belief and worship of his fathers, is in most cases repelled by the religion of a foreign nation. But no two world-religions differ from each other as much as all in common differ from the religion revealed in Jesus Christ. The difference amounts to contrariety, and even to antagonism. We do not forget that paganism and Christianity have a common basis in the moral and spiritual constitution of our race, nor that there are beliefs, spiritual instincts, and elements of worship common to both. Yet though presuming and resting upon the natural religious life of mankind, Christianity is nevertheless so distinctive and exclusive that the observances of any world-religion horrify a Christian, whilst the faith and worship of the Christian Church repel a pious pagan.

Hence few if any will deny the broad assertion that no pagan is as such qualified to exercise a trustworthy judgment on the truth of the Bible. Warped by inveterate prejudice, governed by the superstitions of his age and country, and wedded to the faith and practice received by tradition from his ancestors, his judgment is formed, not from clear insight into the spirituality and dignity of revelation, not from a sense of the elevating and transforming virtue of Bible truth, but formed on the assumption that his own belief and worship is for him the best religion, and from a sense of the contradiction of the Bible, as he views it, to his notions of truth and piety. Lacking every requisite qualification, the judgment of an intelligent pagan, thus preoccupied by his own religion, is certainly neither a competent nor a just judgment. His decision respecting the Bible can in the nature of the case have no more claim to

recognition than the opinion of an illiterate peasant on the process of demonstration by which Newton establishes the law of gravitation.

Not that the Bible, when read and studied with a teachable disposition, can shed no light into the benighted soul of a heathen. Not that by poring upon the sacred page the eyes of a heathen may not be opened to see that the religion of the Bible is a better religion than his traditional belief, and that thus he may not be awakened to some just sense of the contrast between Christianity and heathenism. Not that when the Scriptures are studied with readiness of mind, as the Bereans searched them, they have no power to infuse a spirit of inquiry which may lead a pagan to the renunciation of idolatry, and to the faith of the Gospel. But that the errors and superstitions of paganism, in as far as they rule the feelings and influence the judgment, disqualify the devotee of a false religion to see the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ; and most of all, disqualify him to sit in judgment on the superior worthiness of Christianity, or on the self-evidencing power of the Written Word. He has no eye for spiritual truth. Contrasted with a man of spiritual mind, he stands before this Shekinah of the spiritual world like a rude day-laborer, contrasted with an accomplished artist, before the statue of Apollo or a painting of Raphael.

Equally perverse and debasing in their influence upon the judgment are habits of immorality and vice among men, though living in Christian countries. No divine revelation is necessary to teach the moral and spiritual degradation produced by the excesses of wickedness. Common observation and common experience convince every thoughtful man that, disastrous as are the effects of immorality upon society at large, yet the worst consequences fall upon the moral and spiritual nature of the transgressor himself. When by the sordid greed for gain, or ambition for place or dominion, or a passion for any kind of sensual gratification; or when by any course of selfishness the nobler impulses of the heart are repressed, and the frequent

violations of conscience have silenced its voice; then wholly absorbed in earthly objects of pursuit and in the ignoble ends of a selfish life, the sense of right as between man and man is dull, and interest in truth no higher even than the domain of science, not to speak of morality, grows feeble and uncertain. How much greater is the disqualification of an immoral life for the appreciation of moral truth? And how much greater still is the disqualification of the soul, produced by the combined influence of immorality and irreligion, for the recognition of the superior excellence of religious truth? But men sink to a yet lower grade of mental disqualification. Add to these perverting forces the persistent refusal to heed the demands of the Gospel, and the hardening reaction upon the heart of withstanding every thrilling touch of God's Spirit; and how much more blind still does the spiritual eye of the soul become to the divine light of Christianity radiant in the Word of Holy Scripture.

Between men whose minds have been debased by habits of irreligion and the unique spiritual Book belonging to the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ there is no more positive sympathy than between the spiritual truth of Holy Scripture and the darkened mind of the pagan. Indeed there may be less positive sympathy. Men who have a superficial knowledge of the external facts of Christianity, but have for years hardened themselves against its demands as the scribes and Pharisees resisted and perverted the preaching of Christ concerning the kingdom of heaven, acquire by such resistance a kind of repugnance to the Gospel to which the heathen is a stranger. Not a few among pagan nations, sensible of the insufficiency and weakness of their hereditary religion, yearn after a better knowledge of divine things; and when to them in this state of mind the Word of God is proclaimed, they receive the truth with readiness, as did many of the Gentiles in the Apostolic age; whilst in Christian countries many, who closing their eyes habitually to the divine light of the Word persevere in unbelief of the truth, become more and more hostile to the truth, and thus less and

less fitted both to discern its heavenly excellence and to sit in judgment on its self-evidencing power. Even that natural capacity characteristic of all men for the apprehension of divine things, is enfeebled, if not extinguished, by perverse moral opposition to the authority of the Gospel.

Intellectual ignorance, or the simple fact that men have no knowledge of Christianity, must be distinguished from moral ignorance, or that absence of correct knowledge which is the effect of wilful neglect of Christ. In both cases there is darkness of the understanding; but in the former case there is relative innocence, whilst in the latter there is relative guilt. Moral ignorance has its root in positive enmity. Can an enemy of the Gospel, whose enmity has been intensified by an habitual aversion of the will, judge the spiritual Book with which he has been dealing persistently as if it were a lie?

The want of spiritual judgment is not peculiar however to paganism and wickedness. Scripture draws a clear line of demarcation between those who are born of the Spirit and all other classes of men. The kingdom of this world may be classified morally according to particular sins and vices. In crime there are degrees of heinousness; in vice degrees of degradation. Some sins reign more in the sphere of the body; others more in the sphere of the mind. Yet though differing widely from one another, and differing too in the degree of their debasing influence, all forms of wickedness spring from the same bitter root. The moral and religious life of all men who have not received the Gospel of Christ is, according to the doctrine of Scripture, a false and perverted life. This abnormal moral condition is represented by the use of various terms. Our Lord contrasts the life of a Christian with the life of mankind generally by calling the one *spirit* and the other *flesh*. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Agreeably to the import of this terminology, St. Paul distinguishes believers from unbelievers by

naming the one spiritually-minded and the other carnally-minded; and characterizes the two classes by delineating their radical differences. "They that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally-minded is death; but to be spiritually-minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye," addressing believers in Christ at Rome, both Gentiles and Jews, "but ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." To be in the Spirit and thus spiritually-minded describes, according to the teaching of Scripture, the religious life and the moral status of a true believer in Jesus Christ. To be in the flesh and thus carnally-minded describes the natural religious life and the false moral status of all classes of men who have not been renewed by the regenerating power of the Gospel.

The spiritually-minded have an eye for spiritual truth. The light of the spiritual kingdom shining upon them, shines into their hearts, because living the new life of faith in Christ the natural eye for divine truth is healed of the malady of spiritual blindness, and has thus acquired the positive power of spiritual perception. Endowed with this power of perception, the spiritually-minded receive the light of spiritual truth into themselves, just as a sound bodily eye takes in the light of the natural world. Natural sight is not the product directly of the eye, but is the result of the adjustment of the seeing eye to the natural light. So is spiritual vision not the effect of an act of arbitrary volition. No man can see the light of spiritual truth just because he has made up his mind that if there be such supernatural light he will see it, assuming that the spiritual domain in which he stands and the religious life which he lives are neither one nor both an essential factor. Spiritual vision, on the contrary, like natural sight, is the result of the adjust-

ment of the eye of the mind, that is, of the spiritual eye to the nature of spiritual light.

The carnally-minded have no eye for spiritual truth. The light of the spiritual kingdom shining upon them does not shine into their hearts. Their understanding is not enlightened by the light of spiritual truth, because by reason of transgression their understanding is enveloped in darkness, and through unbelief the darkness continues, notwithstanding the fact that the Sun of Righteousness has arisen with healing in His wings. Eyes indeed they have, but they see not. Though carnal, they have an aptitude for the spiritual truth of divine revelation. But "the god of this world has blinded the eyes of them which believe not." The native power of spiritual vision is held in abeyance by the force of moral evil, which, like cataract in the natural eye, suspends the latent aptitude for spiritual things, and thus renders it ineffectual. The manifold wisdom of God shining in the written Word is from them hidden—hidden, not because divine wisdom does not authenticate itself with convincing force, but because they who are "in the flesh" have not received the Spirit of Truth. And they have not the Spirit of Truth, not because the Spirit has not been given, but because the Spirit of Truth who has come to them by the Gospel pouring a flood of light upon them, has not been met by the welcome of an open heart. The Spirit given they have not received. Hence the eye of the soul of the carnally-minded remains blind to the glorious light of spiritual truth; and remains blind no matter how eminent their position in social life, or how great their attainments in learning and scholarship. The Apostle teaches that "none of the princes of this world," that is, not even the distinguished men who take the lead in science and art, in philosophy and literature, are capable of knowing the wisdom of God by virtue of the strength and culture of a carnal mind. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him." The spiritual things of God received and known by those who live in the

communion of love with God, are seen by no carnal eye, heard by no carnal ear, and enter into no carnal heart. "But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit." That believers discern the light of God's manifold wisdom in His revelation, is not due only to the natural fact that they have an eye and an ear and a heart, but due especially to the fact that, having an eye and an ear and heart, they have also the Spirit. The Spirit given has by an act of faith been likewise received; and thus the carnal mind has been changed into a spiritual mind. In consequence of this radical change, believers may know the truth of God revealed to them. "We have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God." A spiritual mind and the power of spiritual discernment, whilst presupposing a native aptitude for spiritual truth, are wrought in men by the quickening power of the Holy Ghost given by our Lord Jesus Christ glorified in heaven.

It has been our aim to do no more than set forth in brief outline what Holy Scripture teaches respecting the nature and conditions of a spiritual mind, or the mind of men who live after the Spirit in distinction from the mind of men who live after the flesh. We have confined ourselves to a few passages. These represent the whole tenor of Scripture on the subject, as well of the Old as of the New Testament. Further citations we forego. One or two may stand for the import of all.

The force of the teaching of the Bible respecting a spiritual mind is valid not only for Christians, but so far at least as concerns the scope of our argument equally valid for thinking men among those who are not Christians. Whether men recognize the Bible as the infallible record of supernatural revelation or not, yet if they accord to this sacred Book no more historical worth and no higher moral dignity than they accord to a classic production in the domain of history or poetry, or to a work of pre-eminent excellence in mathematics or philosophy, they cannot but concede, if they judge as rationally and candidly in the one case as in the other, that the Bible has the right to



speaking for itself, the right to teach not only what the peculiar domain is to which its teaching belongs, but also to presuppose and even to prescribe the qualifications of mind and character requisite in those who would understand and judge its teaching. Less than this no book in any department of art or science, even if it possess only ordinary merit, implies and demands. That a book can have force only for a class of minds in positive sympathy with its genius and aim, is a truism. Is it scientific or rational to presume less of the Bible?

Claiming to record a supernatural revelation from God; claiming to teach the absolute religion whose mission it is to supersede all world-religions, and to manifest the Truth of all truths; the Bible if in any degree whatever it be really what it claims to be, can address directly, not a legal mind, not the æsthetic or mathematical or philosophical mind, but a mind possessing qualities other than these specifically, qualities answerable to the kind of spiritual truth which the Bible represents. Legal indeed the mind answerable to the Bible may be, or æsthetic or mathematical or philosophical; it may be one and all; for the better and richer, the stronger and more cultivated the human mind is, the greater is its capacity, so far forth at least, to rise to the level of the written Word. But other than this also it must be. If the Book be spiritual, the mind adapted to it must be spiritual. The necessity is imperative.

What else is this presumption other than the general principle holding in every department of knowledge and culture? What else than the accepted doctrine that a great work on mathematics is not for an historical but for a mathematical mind? A work on the fine arts not for a financial genius but for cultivated æsthetic taste? What else than that the best work on jurisprudence is designed, not for a physician, but for a lawyer? Does not the principle rule, and rule unchallenged, in every circle of literature? Does not every wise teacher conduct instruction on the basis of the same presumption? Does not every sensible person assume it in his ordinary judgment of men and things?

Did the Bible not proceed on this general principle; did it not, claiming to be a spiritual book, presume a spiritual mind; did it not limit the possibility of intelligent response to men with aptitudes and sympathies answering specifically to its own domain, it would fall below the level even of any ordinary work of purely human authorship; and for want of positiveness and distinctiveness of character the Bible would not be able to authenticate itself as true to any class of inquirers. The notion that, if the Bible be true, any intelligent person, whatever be the character of his moral and religious life, may see its truth and be convinced of it, contradicts itself. It proceeds on the assumption that the Bible may be a distinctly spiritual book, and unlike any work of purely human origin, and yet demands that this Book, so extraordinary and distinctive, authenticate itself to every class of mind—a demand which means, in other words, that the Bible is not a spiritual book and does not belong to a spiritual kingdom. Such a demand would be pronounced preposterous in every other domain of literature.

If natural light be for the bodily eye, as sound is for the ear and flavor for the tongue; if a work on jurisprudence be for a legal mind, as the beautiful in art is for the æsthetic perception; then certainly, according to the same law, if the written Word be the Word of God, animated and filled with the Spirit of God, the truth which it teaches can be discerned and appreciated as truth only by that class of minds whose perceptive powers are quickened, fashioned and enlightened by the same Spirit of God. Otherwise the Bible would not be the Word of God. Did it not presuppose a spiritual capacity answering to its own genius, it would violate a universal law of the human mind, a psychological law which asserts itself spontaneously in the consciousness of our race.

The Book would thus declare that it does not proceed from Him who is the Author of the human mind. Could the natural mind measure the breadth and length, the depth and height of the written Word, and be a competent judge of the claims of the Word to our confidence, such competency would imply that

the books of the Old and New Testament had proceeded from a source no higher than the natural mind itself.

What Holy Scripture means by a spiritual mind cannot be made intelligible to men of the world by words only. According to the teaching of Scripture, a spiritual mind presupposes a spiritual life, a life quickened by the Holy Spirit given by Jesus Christ glorified in heaven. As no man can have a spiritual mind who does not possess spiritual life, so neither can any one discern the nature of a spiritual mind, and distinguish it intelligently from the mind of the flesh, unless he be himself spiritually-minded.

We have already emphasized the Scriptural doctrine that the mind of the flesh or the carnal mind cannot know the things of the Spirit. Our Lord teaches explicitly that the world does not receive the Spirit of Truth, and thus sees not the Spirit neither knows Him; but His disciples know the Spirit, for the Spirit dwelleth with them and shall be in them. The world does not know the things of the spiritual kingdom and does not feel the force of the teaching of the spiritual Book, because the world has not the Spirit of Christ and does not receive the Spirit. For the same reason men of the world can have no insight into the peculiar nature and peculiar capacities of a spiritual mind. The knowledge of what a spiritual mind is can come by that agency only by which the spiritual mind itself is quickened and matured. An attempt to explain this subject satisfactorily to the understanding of those who stand outside the circle of the spiritual kingdom, must in the nature of the case end in failure. Not only end in failure, but serve to make the impression that a spiritual mind is nothing real, but merely a figment of the imagination. Present any truth to the understanding of a man who has no capacity to see the given truth and grasp it, and the natural consequence is twofold: he not only does not understand, but he may infer also that there is nothing to be understood. It is thus worse than useless to attempt the explanation of a spiritual mind to those who have no power to appreciate a spiritual mind, and who at the same

time refuse to receive the Spirit by whose agency alone such power can be acquired and developed.

Here again we presume no more than a common principle. This method of reasoning is not peculiar to the Christian Church. It prevails in every circle of social life. What a legal mind is can be understood by a legal mind. A man not learned in the law does not understand; and to him the nature and distinguishing capacities of a legal mind, cannot be made intelligible by words. So in art. What an ear for music is may be known by one who has an ear for music; not by a sculptor or a painter. Nor is there any way by which a just conception of the peculiar powers of a musical ear may be formed, but by means of that culture which music itself affords. Civilized life develops itself universally in circles, some lower, others higher, some exclusive, others concentric. Not only is there a mind distinguished by traits of character peculiar to every circle of art and science, to every trade and profession, but a clear insight into the nature of the distinguishing traits of mind belonging to a particular circle is limited to those who belong to it. Is not the principle under this two-fold aspect universal in theory and in practice? And is it not universally conceded?

A principle so universally assumed and acknowledged in theory, and so universally applied in the lower and higher circles of social life, may certainly be asserted with the fullest confidence in the domain of religion; and in this peculiar domain nowhere with more freedom and assurance than in the province of Christianity. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are by common consent a unique book. No other volume has such an origin, and such a history. None other has been such a mighty spiritual power. None other possesses a genius so peculiar and distinctive, so pure and elevated in tone. Contrasted with the best productions of every age on philosophy and art, on morals and religion, it is emphatically the one spiritual book of the world.

Two things must therefore be conceded: the one, that the

Bible claiming to be indited by the Holy Ghost and to teach the spiritual truth of divine revelation, can address itself and evidence its truth only to a spiritual mind; the other that inasmuch as no other kind of mental and moral capacity moves on the same plane of life, none other than a spiritual mind is endowed with powers answerable to the genius of the Bible.

The two things are but two aspects of one idea. As the Bible is a spiritual book, and can speak intelligently only to a spiritual mind, so it is a spiritual mind only that is capable of appreciating the spiritual meaning of the Bible, and thus the only mind capable of passing a judgment on the question respecting the truth of the Bible. The Bible and a spiritual mind occupy the same plane. Between them there is a vital affinity. The two are mutually responsive; the Bible authenticating itself to a spiritual man, as natural light does to the bodily eye, as Blackstone's Commentaries authenticate their worth to a legal mind, and the "Marriage of Figaro" to the ear of a musician. To state the same principle under its correlative aspect: as a cultivated ear only can perceive the beautiful in classic music, as the bodily eye only is adapted to natural light, and as a thoroughly disciplined legal mind only is qualified to pronounce a trustworthy judgment respecting a work on the fundamental principles of jurisprudence, so it is a spiritual eye only that can see spiritual light, a spiritual ear only that can hear a spiritual word, and a spiritual judgment only that can discriminate between truth and error in the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ.

From this general principle, that the Bible being a spiritual Book is self-evidencing to a spiritual mind, and conversely that a spiritual mind only can discern the interior sense of the Bible and pass judgment on its claim to our confidence, we may draw several practical inferences bearing directly on the conflicts of our time between Christianity and scientific unbelief.

1. No argument drawn from the observance and classification of the phenomena of the natural world, however extensive and thorough, can touch the principle on which Holy Scripture

commands and justifies our confidence. Every generalization by induction from external and tangible facts can penetrate no deeper, to say the most, than the laws and forces operating in nature. The spiritual side of the natural world inductive science cannot see. Nor can it discern or disclose the unseen but real and vital bond of connection between the natural and the spiritual. That inductive science cannot grasp subphenomenal realities, nor answer any question which presupposes the presence and the primordial forces of the spiritual world, science itself confesses. This confession, however, is an unwilling and undesigned testimony to the reality of spiritual truth and to the fact of the spiritual world. Feeble as its power may be, the scientist has after all a spiritual eye. Otherwise he could have no sense or conception whatever, neither negative nor positive, of the divine and spiritual, respecting which agreeably to his own judgment he can acquire no knowledge by reasoning from natural phenomena.

Let those then who seek the spiritual in the domain of the natural only, maintain that they can find no God, and can infer no knowledge of spiritual things. Such uncertainty and ignorance are legitimate. What else is this than what the Word of God proclaims, that men by searching cannot find out God? The world by its superficial wisdom cannot know God. And so long as men of the world neglect the latent capacity of spiritual vision with which they are endowed, and attempt to judge of things lying entirely beyond the scope of the understanding by means of the superficial knowledge gained by the observance of the objects of sense, such ignorance of God must continue. The consequence is that their opinions and reasonings respecting Holy Scripture are shallow and perverse, being formed from a sphere of things which can afford no criterion of legitimate judgment concerning a spiritual Book. So long as a man contemplates Scripture only by the natural eye, and endeavors to estimate its contents by a standard given by natural science, the truth of the Bible lies beyond the range of his vision and eludes his grasp. It is then sheer weakness in a

Christian, if not something worse, to allow his faith to be disturbed by any attacks on the truth of Holy Scripture by men who confessedly have no knowledge but natural knowledge, and ignore the power of spiritual vision by which only the spiritual truth of Holy Scripture can be seen.

2. The fact that learned men earnestly desiring the knowledge of truth and searching for it in the domain of the discursive sciences or in the region of metaphysics, do not see and feel the self-evidencing force of Holy Scripture, can be to the intelligent Christian no occasion of embarrassment or doubt. The distinguishing truths of Holy Scripture are taught in Holy Scripture; not by the cosmos, not by the human reason. However patiently and persistently men may delve in the realm of the physical and metaphysical, they are not thereby brought face to face before the spiritual truth of the Bible, nor do they thus discipline and strengthen the spiritual eye of their mind. Indeed like every other inborn faculty, the latent capacity for discerning spiritual things which every man possesses, becomes weaker and more obtuse by neglect and abuse; so that it may be, that a prince among naturalists, whose mind has all his life-long been absorbed in the contemplation merely of nature and natural phenomena, may have much less power to see the worth of spiritual truth than an uneducated man who has read and studied no book other than the Bible. Nay more. Such savant when he has reached the zenith of scientific strength, may have far less spiritual acumen, and far less power of sound spiritual judgment than he had before he began the career which has led to worldly eminence.

3. The power of spiritual perception and of a sound spiritual judgment, can be developed and strengthened only by legitimate exercise. Light is for the eye; sound for the ear. It is the use of the eye in looking at visible objects that strengthens the sight. So of the ear. The same law governs in the realm of the spiritual. The spiritual eye of the soul becomes stronger and more acute by the exercise of the eye on spiritual objects. A sound judgment respecting the contents of Holy Scripture



can be acquired in no other way than by contact with the spiritual power immanent in Holy Scripture. The written Word alone disciplines and perfects the capacity of a man to pass judgment on the written Word. Hence it is in every respect agreeable to the nature of things that the Bible evidence itself is divine to the heart of a true believer, whilst other men, whose eyes are blinded by the exclusive observation of natural objects, and by exclusive devotion to worldly pursuits, see in the divine Word of the sacred Volume no self-evidencing force.

4. The self-evidencing power of Christian truth is the chief reliance of the ministry in preaching the gospel with convincing effect to every class of skeptics and worldly-minded men. Christ does not by His Spirit address primarily the logical understanding or the discursive reason, but addresses that spiritual capacity and affinity for divine things latent in the heart of every man in whom the life of the image of God has not been utterly debased. Even when men deny theoretically the faith of the gospel and pronounce Scripture and the church the work of designing men, they are ten-fold more accessible to the power of the Word proclaimed in simplicity and with authority, than they are to the force of logical reasoning directed against the errors and fallacies of skepticism. Argument addressed to the understanding, however valid and conclusive in itself, serves rather to confirm a man in the false and unphilosophical notion that he must first by logical proof be convinced of the truth of Christianity before it can be rational and manly to accede to the demands of the Gospel.

## ART. VII.—ATONEMENT, SACRIFICE AND SACRAMENT.

BY M. KIEFFER, D.D. :

"THE river Ilissus, in Athens," says the Rev. Joseph Cook, in the introduction to his famous lecture on the atonement, delivered in Tremont Temple, Boston, May 7, 1877, "is a delicious crystalline stream, full of white and brown pebbles, which no doubt the feet of Phocion, and Socrates, and Demosthenes, and Plato, and Aristotle have touched.

"Its ripples therefore are more musical than Apollo's lute; and you will not blame me for stating that I brought home with me from Athens a broad fair pebble out of that stream, and from that portion of its bed, which scholars say, was once crossed by the gardens and walks and marble colonnades of Aristotle's Lyceum.

"I keep this white stone now as a paper weight on a heap of excerpts and newspaper cuttings intended to represent current misconceptions of Christian truth. Quite a number of slips have been accumulating in that heap of late, some of them from Music Hall."

It is easy to conceive that the paper-weight of our learned lecturer may in the way indicated, in a short time, be lifted as high above the study-table as the ceiling of the room. No collector of crystals has ever been able "to capture more gems" than it is possible to collect specimens of misconceptions of Christian truth.

We gain but little by an effort to classify. It is more profitable to ask, why is it that there are so many enlightened and well educated minds even, that generally "miss" in the formation of their conceptions of Christian truth? That

truth itself is certainly not a misconception. Its revelation is certainly full and complete. Yet we find, that the various views of many leading divines representing different theological schools and modes of thought, both ancient and modern, are much more curious than scientific. It is with propriety therefore that our learned Lecturer speaks of his collection as a "curiosity." We acknowledge that we also are "curious" to see it. In the mean time we modestly suggest that such phenomenon can be accounted for by the fact that men fail to study the truth and to apprehend it in its unity. They deal in truths, and not in the truth. They forget that truths when separated from the truth will as certainly wither and die as will the branches when separated from the vine.

The lecture itself to which we have referred is a noble exception to the fragmentary thinking of the age, and place in which it was delivered. It is full of thought and is on the side of truth, evangelical truth, over against modern Socinianism on the one side, and that rigid dogmatism on the other which looks with a prejudiced eye upon the free development of theology in its vital and necessary relation to natural and moral science. It is a noble effort to grasp and to give utterance to the true idea of the Christian atonement.

Rev. Joseph Cook is evidently in communion with the best and most matured evangelical divines and scholars of both Germany and England as well as our own country. He does not follow either one of them slavishly; yet he knows how to enter into their labors, and how to reproduce with power and effect their Christological views.

Our design in thus referring to the Tremont Lecture is, neither to eulogize, nor to criticize, but simply to add our testimony to the concrete mode of Christian thought, and to acknowledge the fact of the atonement as "supreme."

"The supreme fact of the atonement" involves the true ideas of sacrifice and sacrament in their vital relation to each other. We have here an essential "triunitas." By this we mean that as the atonement presupposes sacrifice so it postulates sacrament; the latter is no less essential than the former.

For the first part of our proposition, we presume, the general theological mind of our day is prepared; but we doubt whether it is fully prepared for the second part.

The expressions, "sacrificial atonement" and "atoning sacrifice" are quite familiar, and are acknowledged at once to be according to the analogy of our common Christian faith. It would indeed sound just as orthodox to say that the "Christ sacrifice" is the supreme fact of our religion, as it would to say that the atonement is such supreme fact. But to the proposition: "Our holy Christian religion is essentially sacramental," or "the atonement is essentially sacramental," not all by any means are ready to subscribe. Many indeed would not only regard this sentence as a misconception of Christian truth, but as a dangerous error. We furnish the cutting for serious examination, at the risk of its being placed under the paper-weight brought from the bed of the river Ilissus as a misconception and a curiosity.

Sacrifice and atonement, in their most comprehensive meanings, are related as the "*creatione activa sumta*" and the "*creatione passiva sumta*" of the scholastic divines. The first expression designates the divine mystery of the creative act, and the second its stupendous result, the created universe actually existing in space and time. The two conceptions are obviously distinct, as the cause is always to be distinguished from its effect. But it is equally clear at the same time that if the two ideas are permitted to fall entirely apart in our thinking, and are not held together in their concrete union, there can be no proper apprehension of the great reality under either view. As there is no effect without a cause, so there is no cause without an effect: the one is in the other. Philosophers and divines sometimes speak of unactualized possibilities; and for aught we know there is an infinite number of these slumbering in the divine nature, that will be never actualized. But this is groundless speculation indeed. If such possibilities are really slumbering in the divine mind, what prevents us from supposing that they are not to slumber for ever, but, in God's

time and way, will become actualities. We cannot limit omnipotence. He who has created millions upon millions of worlds may doubtless create millions upon millions more, so we are obliged to exclaim with the astonished poet in view of the overwhelming wonder:

"All thought is lost and reason drowned  
In the immense survey.  
We cannot fathom the profound,  
Nor trace Jehovah's way."

But this we can trace, and this we can know, that, notwithstanding the countless worlds spoken into existence by the Omnipotent word, and the measureless space which they occupy, there is but *one* creation, and but one Creator, "in and for and through whom all things consist." This grand reality apprehended, not as the result of reasoning from effect to cause, and from cause to effect, but by a living intuitional faith, answering to the devotional language of Christendom, expressed in the first article of its creed, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth," gives us the true idea of the universe—the universe of being; the Absolute Being; the relative being; the personal and the impersonal. The very idea of the Absolute Being is that of all-controlling thought and will. That thought is as broad and deep as the universe itself. That will, holy and wise, is the law of universal existence. Hence we find everywhere, in the midst of endless variety, unity of idea, and unity of design. And here we have revealed, in the very first article of our common creed, not dimly by any means, but clearly and fully, the true and primary idea of the atonement.

The *created* universe, "all things visible and invisible," is in harmony with itself as well as with the nature and will of its Author. All its forces, according to the testimony of those who have studied and solved the wondrous problem, tend to the unity and preservation of the whole, none to its separation or destruction. This of itself shows that they are directed by the wisdom of Him who cannot err, and that in their organic

union they are grounded in and are governed by His omnipotent will. It shows indeed that the creation answers exactly to its own idea, and that the law of its life is the will of the Absolute.

As certainly as the smooth and quiet waters of the sea reflect truly the glories of the nightly sky, with every star and every tint of blue, so truly does the great sea of created being reflect the mind and purpose of the Divine Being.

The universe then, we say, existing, living, moving, acting as God wills, is the at-one-ment. All the parts are held together by the same plastic power, they are animated by the same spirit; they are performing their wondrous march through time and space toward the same glorious end. Under this primary view of the atonement it is a result—it is a fact, it has been made, and as such it reveals the law of sacrifice. We know that God is all-sufficient in Himself. He does not need this universe of creatures to add to His essential glory.

But we know too that God is love. And as said by Dr. Baley, "it is the very nature of love to give to others the highest degree of satisfaction out of itself." "Had there not been infinite love in the Creator," says this author, "there would have been no energy in Him, no power, no purpose, no motive that could have produced so grand a universe as that which surrounds us in all its greatness and in all its minuteness. Our grand shining universe accordingly is the outbirth of the Infinite Love. It is its free gift, its spotless sacrifice. The creature is because the Creator is. It is the nature of love to bless, to make sacred (*sacrum* and *facio*) and to make happy.

The Infinite Love being the principle of the creation, is also the law of its being. In other words, as we shall see more clearly after a while, sacrifice is the law of the universe.

Is it then also vicarious? Certainly. A vicarious act is simply a voluntary act done for another. The infinite love of God is personified in His only begotten Son, the *πρωτοτοκος*. He is the Alpha and the Omega of the creation. "He is in the world, and the world was made by him." "Without him was not anything made that was made."

When He "stretched out the heavens as a curtain and laid the foundations of the earth," He did not seek His own will, or His own glory, but the will and glory of the Father. Thus the Infinite Love, eternally personal, when It manifested Its creative power and wisdom, was in the full meaning of the term vicarious; and hence the created universe is the grand result of vicarious sacrifice. This it is in its continuation too as well as in its beginning, in its Exodus as well as in its Genesis.

Here, as before intimated, the sentence is of full force that the distinction of cause and effect must not be forced into a separation. On the contrary the creation is a fact for all time. It is real just because the omnipotent love which is its cause is also the law of its being. It is "the almighty and everywhere present power of God, whereby as it were by His hand, He still upholds heaven and earth with all creatures."

He has brought them into existence not to banish them from His presence, but to abide with them, and to communicate to them more and more His love and goodness.

It seems as though the Infinite were for the finite, the Absolute for the relative, God, the Good One, for the good of His creatures. His goodness is going out from Him continually toward them. "His tender mercies are over all His works."

This is the great offering, *the sacrifice*, God giving Himself through His Son. From this absolute offering all the forms of sacrifice in the phenomenal universe derive their character and meaning. It is the great antitype of which nature itself is the type. Not in the sense of an empty shadow or figure by any means, but in the sense of a real internal correlation.

Hence the idea of sacrifice is actualized throughout the entire domain of nature as a constant, unvarying law. Its kingdoms do not exist separately for themselves. Suns, moons, and stars, as well as angels and men, are set in families, and are for each other. The mineral kingdom of our earth furnishes the foundation and soil for the vegetable kingdom; this sacrifices itself to the animal; and all unitedly bring their



richest offerings and lay them upon a common altar for the good of man. In the human family, whether persons are conscious of it or not, the same law is in full force. Parents live, toil, and suffer for their children. The descendants, live upon, and enjoy, the fruits of the labors of their ancestors. One generation of men clears away the forests and improves the country for the good of the generation to come. So that no man lives for himself but always for others. Our daily food and clothing are mostly prepared for us by other hands. Indeed we live upon sacrifice, that is, upon nature's gifts, and upon the toil and sweat, and lives of our fellow-men sacrificed for us.

But, do we not live and move and have our being in God? Certainly. And for this very reason we insist upon it that the relation between our type and antitype is internal and vital, so close and intimate, that in the one we have the other. The God-sacrifice is the natural, and the natural is divine. God sustains our lives through nature as a mean. Nature's offerings are God's gifts, whilst they are the tokens of His presence. Here the popular intuition is much nearer the truth than that science which studies nature as its text book without seeing in it at all the mind and image of its author. Such science may speak eloquently of natural law and natural beauty; but it cannot bring any one into union and communion with the true and real. It turns attention to a great temple without beholding the shekinah within—to a theatre where the stage and the actors remain behind the curtain, and are not seen. In the view of such science nature is not real; it is an empty cloud, a shadow, a fashion that is passing away. It has no fixed identity.

Its *true* description is vastly more eloquent and ennobling. It speaks too of general laws and forces, of life and beauty; but it does not lose sight of the eternal nature of law and power. In the life of nature it sees the fountain and source of all life; in its beauty it sees the ideal beauty; and in its gifts it sees the absolute Gift and Giver.

We may say truly that nature "renews itself before the omniscient eye of God," that it yearly clothes itself in vernal green; but we mean by the expressions that God covers the trees of the forest with foliage, and that He "clothes the grass of the field." We admire the beautiful flowers planted all over nature's broad field; but we know it is God that individualizes in every instance; that "He paints the lily and perfumes the rose."

To study nature truly therefore is to study God, to know it is to know Him; and to live upon its gifts and offerings is to live in Him. We are aware that it may be maintained over against this, with some show of plausibility, but without the least real force of argument, that we have here borrowed the ideas of the Christian atonement and the Christian sacrifice and transferred them to the sphere of natural religion. But this is not the question. Perhaps upon close examination it might be discovered that nearly all our Christian symbols, figures, and even terminology are taken from nature. That certainly does not detract from their appropriateness and their value. So in considering the great realities of natural religion, we can't see why we should not view them from the Christian stand-point. Are they what they seem to be? This is the question at issue. The created universe in its normal relation to the Creator, is the real natural atonement, revealing the law of sacrifice, whether it can be seen or not with the eye of skeptical science. It were a severe requirement indeed that would forbid our giving assent to this great fact until we can secure the concurrence of a Pyrrho and his followers. We do not claim that it could be discovered without faith. The world never had a natural religion before it was blessed with the supernatural. Its philosophy could not find out God; much less could it solve the problem of the universe.

"Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." This inspired language gives us essentially the rich contents of the first article of our

creed. We have here in idea and germ all that is subsequently revealed. It is here evident that the faith which gives us such understanding as the Apostle names, namely, that "the worlds were framed by the word of God," and that the visible is the symbol of the invisible, is something vastly more than a subjective assent to the objective reality outwardly revealed. It has for its contents the great mystery itself. The believer, in apprehending, in knowing, realizes that he is apprehended. He is in the universe thus framed, and it is in him. He is in God and God is in him. The Almighty Maker of heaven and earth is his Father, and he is heir of all things. The infinite love of God as revealed in the creation and preservation of the worlds is now a fact of consciousness. And this brings with it a sense of personal responsibility and obligation; and personal obligation necessarily postulates the sacrament.

Here we are just at the place where we propose to take the promised risk of furnishing for examination the sentence, namely, that the atonement embodying the all-controlling law of sacrifice is necessarily and essentially sacramental.

It is proposed that the sentence be examined first of all in the broad domain in which we now are, namely, of natural religion. We do not say exclusively in its light; for, that is impossible, since the supernatural revelation, with which we are favored, is in the natural, so that they mingle their beams and send forth but one stream of radiance.

To ascertain the truth in the case we need not consult the various views that have been entertained as to what the sacrament really is or what it is not. If Baptism, for instance, as some think, is nothing more than a sprinkling with, or an immersing in water, then certainly it is not regeneration. And for those who can see nothing more than bread and wine in the elements of the eucharist there is certainly no real presence of the Lord. Albeit regeneration is baptism, and the Lord's body may really be discerned in His supper.

It is sufficient for our purpose to take the word sacrament in its strict etymological meaning. Take it simply as an oath of

obligation; such oath as a commander-in-chief takes from his soldiers, or a king from his subjects. This is sacred of course, implying oneness of interest and oneness of national life. The king and his subjects are as a community.

We reason first from analogy. We see that the physical universe is governed by a twofold force or law; a centrifugal force and a centripetal. The latter is no less essential and important than the former. So exactly are these forces balanced that the distances and the revolutions of the planets, as we know, can be measured with mathematical certainty. All, bound by this law, revolve around a common centre. The one force answers to the general law of sacrifice and the other to that of sacrament. In the actual union of the two does the wondrous frame-work of universal nature maintain its at-onement.

It is but a dictate of reason that He, who has created the suns, moons and stars, or as the apostle expresses it, has "framed the worlds," should bind them to His service. For this they were made, namely, for the honor and praise of His name. All are headed in Him. The same two-fold law is of force in the higher domain of the personal creation. Angels and men, made especially in the image and likeness of God, hence partakers of the divine nature, have given them a certain sphere of freedom. They are self-determining; have the power of choice. This answers to the centrifugal force in nature. But their freedom is in law. It has also its centripetal force which keeps them in their proper orbits and draws them to the centre of their being. They are bound as by an oath to love Him who first loved them; yea, to hearken to His words and to obey His commandments. All personal creatures, whether in the heavens above, or on the earth beneath us, are thus bound. Sublime thought! The universe filled with personal spirits consciously living, and moving in God, who is the absolute personal spirit, drawn toward Him as to their central sun, and for this reason called "the sacramental host of God's elect." But, we hear it said: "If personal obligation be sac-

ramental, then there is not any need of further argument; we believe the very essence of religion and morality is a sense of personal responsibility." Such it is indeed in its internal spiritual nature, or, as we usually say, "subjectively considered." But the subjective always implies the objective. The universe is both personal and impersonal, inward and outward. Throughout we trace a deep view of their organic union. The binding power, of which we are speaking, relates to both. The allegiance of the subjects to their monarch implies a common country, land, soil, institutions, homes, history, laws, customs, rights, privileges, etc., all of which enter into and modify more or less the personal life of the individual. These are elements of loyalty: sacramental elements signifying and sealing the real presence of an all over-shadowing government. The binding power is from within and from above; it is spiritual, yet it pervades all, and is in all. Thus God, the sovereign of the universe, whilst He is transcendent, is also immanent. He approaches the personal creature through His works. Nature is the outward visible sign and seal of the Real Invisible Presence. It not only strengthens the bond of personal obligation, as a real sacramental element, but it is the very form in which we are bound to the divine service. This thought is fully expressed by the inspired apostle, Rom. i. 20. "The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and godhead; *so that they are without excuse.*" We need not stop to inquire here whether the tree of life in the garden of Eden had a sacramental meaning: all nature is paradise, all is sacrament.

The seer of the new covenant, describing heaven, says, "there is no temple there," evidently because all heaven is temple: or, as he expresses it, "The Lord God and the Lamb are the temple of it." So with the universe of God, in its normal relation to Him, we mean, of course, is all at-onement, it is all aglow with the infinite love and glory, it is all sacrament. It is a real eucharistic communion, a joint participation, on the part

of living creatures, in the benefits bestowed by the "author and giver of every good gift." "All eyes wait upon him and he giveth them their meat in due season." A eucharistic feast upon sacrifice, as we have seen.

This hasty glance at the natural is sufficient for our purpose. We can't help but conclude that the ideas of sacrament, sacrifice and atonement, interpenetrate each other, and are mutually complementary. All creatures, visible and invisible, suns, moons, and stars, angels and men, we say, are sacramentally bound to their adorable Creator. And who, that has come to a consciousness of the rich contents of the first article of our faith could wish it otherwise? Who would have God change the order of things?

"Who would have Thee change, O Lord?  
For kinder couldst Thou never be;  
Thy love is one great golden cord,  
Binding the universe to Thee."

So far, we think, our cutting has sustained a pretty favorable examination. It may be regarded as somewhat curious, but we are not exactly agreed to have it classed with the "misconceptions of Christian truth." Before we proceed to examine it in the light of sacred history, and in the full, clear light of Christianity, it may be well to remember that the religion of redemption cannot go beyond the facts and possibilities of the natural as its true adumbration. The Christian religion is not developed from the natural. We do not say that it is, by any means. But we say, that as soteriological power, or religion of human redemption, it can only bring man back to the state which he occupied before his sin and fall, and raise him to the scale of being for which he was designed in his creation. The cosmological character and positive life, which it reveals, are included in this. To give it a power beyond this is to force it beyond its own proper conception. Rather than to do such violence to this most sacred of all ideas, and thus admit the rationalistic principle which teaches that the sin of the human family is not an evil really, but a great advantage, we adopt the much more

plausible view of some of our best divines, that humanity would have had the Son of God as its personal central head even if man had kept his first estate. But this is not the place for the discussion of this point. Our design is simply to claim the presumptive evidence in favor of our sacramental view. If there is a centripetal force in natural religion binding all to God as a common and central head, we have a right to presume that we shall find the same force in the supernatural, which is in the natural. The argument of analogy is not wanting by any means, but is in full force at every point.

The triune thought of atonement, sacrifice and sacrament, as we have seen it unfolded in the natural creation, runs through the whole supernatural revelation from its alpha to its omega. It looks forward and upward to a final oneness, to the "reheading of all things in Christ." Hence, His great proposition is: "Behold I create all things new, a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." That is the Christian atonement in its full actualization as distinguished from the natural. It is indeed the old, as affected by sin, made new. Keeping this in view, we can proceed with a more steady and certain step in the further investigation of our subject.

We need not here repeat the history of man's sin and fall; we need not trace the abnormal development of the human race. The dark chapter has been read; its contents are known. But even from this we might draw an argument, inasmuch as darkness presupposes light, and error truth. This abnormal life of the race unfolds the law of sacrifice abnormally in the very form of most unholy and ungodly communions. Large streams of blood have been shed in sacrificing victims to false gods, and great have been the feasting at the tables of the wicked one. "All flesh has corrupted its way before God." The entire body of humanity is depraved. "The whole head is sick and the heart faint." "From the crowns of our heads to the soles of our feet we are nothing but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores." The result of sin, we are taught, is death. "Dead in trespasses and in sin." It is enmity of mind



against God, and alienation from Him by wicked works. (Col. i. 21). Hence, redemption unto life must needs be a redemption from sin. And a complete reconciliation to God can only be brought about in the way of the regeneration of our nature and its complete sanctification.

This is taught in all God's dealings with His ancient chosen people. Separated from the other nations of the earth, they were to be a holy people—"a chosen generation and a royal priesthood."

Their entire history, therefore, must be regarded as a type of the future kingdom of Christ. And since the powers of His kingdom are all primarily in His person, all the prophecies, the teachings, the purifications, the sacrifices, the festivals, the worship, etc., of the Old Testament, have reference to Him, in whom alone they find their fulfilment.

He is the seed of the woman that shall bruise the serpent's head. He is the Shiloh that is to come. He is Israel's pillar of cloud by day, and pillar of fire by night. He is the manna from heaven that feeds them, and the Rock whence flows the living water that quenches their thirst. He is their tabernacle, with its "holiest of holies," its altar, its mercy-seat, its table of shew-bread, and its golden candlestick. He is, subsequently, the great temple, all glorious within and without, because of His indwelling presence. Throughout the whole of Old Testament economy, He is all in all; not yet in virtue of a personal union with humanity, but in virtue of a substantial indwelling as the divine factor of the sacred history. The prophets, inspired by His Spirit, speak *His* word; the priests are holy and minister at *His* altar; the kings are also His anointed, and rule in His name; all types and representatives of Him, who is the absolute prophet, priest and king. Hence the awful and deep solemnity of the religious institutions and observances of that preparatory period. All is holy; the land, the cities, the laws, the people, cut off from the old Adamic nature by circumcision, the sacrifices, the festivals, and above all the altar.

The whole religion is that of sacrifice, looking to the atone-

ment. The nature and design of these types is so fully, and concisely expressed by Dr. Kurtz, in his *Sacred History*, that we here take the liberty of quoting his language. See Lev. Chap. i. vii.

"The signification of sacrifices, in general, may be ascertained from Lev. xvii. 11. "The life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." It is the design of the sacrifices to make an atonement for sin. Now sin is brought forth by lust; the seat and source of lust are in the soul, (James i. 14, 15), and the soul dwells in the blood—this sin proceeds from the blood. Hence the punishment is directed against the blood, the seat of the soul. "The wages of sin is death." Rom. vi. 23. The animal which is sacrificed, suffers death vicariously, or in the place of the sinner, and God accepts this substitution. "Without shedding of blood is no remission," (Heb. ix. 22); nevertheless, "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins, (Heb. x. 4,) for the animal is not offered by a voluntary act of its own; its life is no real equivalent, and the substitution derives no validity from any natural and necessary bond of union and communion. Hence, the sacrifice of the animal could not win forgiveness by its own inherent power, but merely serve as a shadow and type of the sacrifice of Christ, who, being God and man, poured out His soul unto death, (Isa. liii. 12), and whose sufferings and death possess infinite value and eternal validity."

"He who brought the sacrifice conducted the animal to the tabernacle, laid his hands on its head, and thus transferred, symbolically, his own sinfulness to the animal, and consecrated it as his substitute; he then killed it himself, in order to indicate that, on account of his sins, he deserved the death which the animal suffered in his place. The priest took the blood and sprinkled it on the altar in the court of the tabernacle, as a seal of the atonement which God had accepted and acknowledged. The whole or part of the flesh of the animal was

burnt on the altar. The fire, an image of purification and sanctification, caused the offering to ascend towards heaven, to Jehovah; the flesh, including the sinews and bones, or the body, is the organ of all action—the act of burning, hence, denoted the sanctification and surrender of all the powers of the individual to Jehovah, as the consequence of the atonement (justification followed by sanctification). With the flesh were consumed the meat-offerings and drink-offerings; namely, bread, (Lev. ch. ii.) and wine (Ex. xxix. 40) with the addition of oil, frankincense, and salt. The bread and wine are emblematic of the fruits of sanctification (the fruits of spiritual labor in the field of the kingdom of God, and in the vineyard of the Lord.) The oil is an emblem of the Holy Spirit, by whose grace good works are performed; the frankincense, denotes that these are commenced and completed with prayer, and the salt denotes that they are incorruptible and enduring witnesses of the covenant of grace made with Jehovah (Rev. xiv. 13).

The flesh of certain offerings (peace offerings) was not entirely burned; the larger portion was reserved for a sacrificial repast. Jehovah was the host: the person who brought the offering, ate at His table, as if he were admitted to the abode and table of Jehovah. Hence, the sacrificial repast was emblematic of the highest sacramental communion with Jehovah."

What is here stated by our learned author has been carefully gathered from the inspired record, as any one can see who examines for himself. It is to the last part of the quotation that we would turn attention, as furnishing the strongest testimony to the *sacramental* character of sacrifice.

Then, in our sacred History, follows immediately and in proper order, the chapter on the holy festivals.

It would lead us too far into detail to enumerate them, and to unfold the significance of each festival separately. The chapter itself is a distinct one, and its leading thought seems to run along a line parallel with the developed idea of sacrifice. It seems as though sacrifice were one thing and the sacramental festival another. But this is only seemingly so. In

*fact*, they have both the same ideal. The central thought of the atonement runs through all the sacrifices and holy festivals at the same time, and unites them in a concrete unity. Only in virtue of such unity can they have their distinct and special meanings.

It can be seen at a glance, that without the sacrifices the festivals could have no sacred meaning whatever; and without the festivals there is no real actualization of the idea of sacrifice. Here strictly, as in the broad domain of the natural, the idea of sacrifice unfolds its meaning in an atonement, that holds in the form of sacramental union. The festival is a eucharistic feasting upon sacrifice—a communion, a joint participation in a common benefit, on the part of those who are in God's covenant.

A single illustration will suffice. The general idea is set forth by the Holy Festival of the Passover, which continued eight days, and was observed in great solemnity in commemoration of the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage. It has all its significance from the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb, which was appointed, like all the other sacrifices, to be an atonement for sin. (See Exod. ch. vii. 11.) "By the striking of the blood of the lamb on the door-posts," as said by the author quoted before, "each house of the Israelites was designated as an altar of God, and its occupants were admitted as partakers of the atonement made by the sacrifice. This blood was, consequently, not intended to enable the destroying angel to recognize the houses of the Israelites, but to make atonement for them, in order that he might pass over them."

The paschal repast was accordingly sacrificial, and indicated at the same time, the sacramental communion which God founded on the atonement which was made.

This is further shown by the momenta of a sacrifice that is acceptable to God. 1. A lamb is to be selected without blemish and without spot—sinlessness. 2. By the symbolical laying on of the hands of the priest, the sins of the people, for

whom the atonement is to be made, are made over to the sinless and innocent victim—imputation. 3. These sins now being its sins the lamb's blood is shed, it is slain; the innocent for the guilty—expiation. Symbolically and really the flesh of the slain lamb is to be given for those to eat whose sins are atoned for—sacramental communion. Can any one say truly that the last prerequisite to an acceptable sacrifice, is not essential? Is it not most reasonable, as well as scriptural, that the infinite love of God sacrificially revealed in the institutions of His own founding, as well as in His works, should lay His subjective creatures, those made in His image—capable of knowing Him and enjoying His favor for ever, under obligations to love and to serve Him? Less than this could not be expected from the relation subsisting between them, and the fullness of the revelation that He has made. This love is eternal; hence revealed everywhere throughout the created universe, and in the successive stages of that sacred history of which it is the ruling factor: we mean the history of His ancient covenant people. Yet the real love revelation is not full; because the fullness of its time has not yet come. It may be complete as a type, because God is in it, just as nature is complete, in the same sense, in virtue of the same indwelling. Nature and history here answer to each other, just as face answers to face when a man looks into a mirror. That, we think, is the very meaning of the word *Institution*, as of sacrifice and sacraments, to place man in his proper, normal relation to his environments, (nature) and to God, and to put into him God's Spirit; so he can say with the whole normal universe: "I in God, God in me." Such mutual indwelling, such atonement of the divine and human, however, can only be complete in an actual incarnation. That is the real Desire of all nations, and the real Hope of Israel. All then, as far as we have come is type, looking to the antitype that is future. All sacred history is prophetic looking to a glorious fulfilment in the time to come. The paschal lamb of the past looks to the Lamb spoken of by John when he said: "Behold the Lamb of

God that taketh away the sin of the world"; and by Peter, when he said of Christ that He is a "Lamb without blemish and without spot." Blessed be God the typical and prophetic has come to its fulfillment. The fulness of time *has* come. "The Word has been made flesh," and dwells among us—"full of grace and truth." The Lamb decretively slain from the foundation of the world, and typically in the sacrifices of the Old Testament dispensation, has actually been slain as a sacrifice once for all. "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength," and honor, and glory, and blessing." "In His blood we have the atonement." "His blood cleanses from all sin." This blessed Gospel we have; we live under its dispensation; and it only remains for us to examine our triune idea in its light, and our task is accomplished. The evidence of nature and of sacred history, as far as examined, is unmistakably in its favor: and should there be nothing found in the dispensation of the Spirit to militate against it, it will stand as a monument of the truth. We anticipate that there will not only be nothing found against it, but that the positive evidence in its favor will place it beyond and above doubt. As we proceed we must be careful to keep our eyes steadily fixed upon our grand ideal, actualized as a historical fact in the person of Christ; and not permit ourselves to be drawn into by-paths by the speculations of distinguished thinkers. It is not with subjective views, not with doctrines, or teachings in regard to the atonement, that we have to do here, but with the great and momentous fact itself.

Its idea, as it is in itself, and as typified in nature and history, is as high, broad and deep, as that of universal being. It demands not only oneness and harmony in the Absolute Being, in God; the oneness and harmony of His attributes, for instance, His justice, His wisdom, and His love; it postulates not only oneness and harmony throughout the vast domain of relative existence, separately considered, harmonious union of the parts, among themselves, and with the whole; but it demands most imperiously also the harmonious union of the rela-

tive with the Absolute—the creature with God. This grand idea really actualized in the Person of the historical Christ, is the Christian atonement.

We say emphatically the *historic Christ*, in opposition to all utterances of Ebionites, and Gnostics, ancient and modern, who deny that Christ has come in the flesh, and consequently, that Christianity is historical.

This great fact is the antitype of which nature and history are the type. We say *type* (and not *types*) designedly, because the historical revelation is the natural only, in the process of development in the sphere of personal consciousness. In this all-comprehensive sense we acknowledge the atonement as "the supreme fact;" we bow in spirit before it, and reverence it. Not in the view, we repeat, that it stands the highest among other realities, towering above them; but just in the sense that *all* other actualizations in the universe have significance and realness only in virtue of their concrete union with it.

"Christ all in all." He is this grand and glorious ideal personified, and its actualization in time. *He* is the Absolute Personal Word, and the Word made flesh. He is the Alpha, the eternal beginning of the space and time form of existence, and also its Omega, its highest end: and finally He is the real historical Exodus from this beginning to this end. He is the great time-book written full in in the inside and on the outside, every sentence and word deriving its import from His Person. Thus He is the Head, the centre, the unity—in a word, the *at-one-ment*, of universal being, the Absolute Being, the relative—the personal and impersonal.

Does it, under this view, answer to the postulate of its own idea? Is it the *real* antitype of its type? Is it sacrificial, answering the prerequisites of acceptable offering? Is it vicarious? To these questions there is but one answer: that is from above, from all around, and from the depths of the God-consciousness within us, it is, "Yea and Amen."

The questions are relevant, but they scarcely call for separate answers. They are in themselves the strongest affirmations.



These have been repeated: yet they cannot be too strongly emphasized.

The first, and second, are answered by the very fact that Christ is, in one Person, God and man, uniting in Himself the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and the fulness of created excellency. Not only humanity is complete in Him, but as before said, the whole creation. For this reason He is called "The First Begotten," and is "Head over all things."

In virtue of the personal union of the Absolute and relative, it has been conceived by one whose thoughts have created a wonderful stir in the religious world, that God *is* a man, that the universe *is* man, and that the Lord Jesus is this great, good and everywhere present man.

The view, we think, confounds the ideas of humanity and personality. Great indeed is the mystery of God manifested in the flesh, and God manifested in the worlds that He hath framed. But it does not deify the creature, nor does it take from God His absoluteness. Our faith in it need not lead to either inference. It satisfies the demands of faith that the Lord is very God and very man, and that His personality is the centre of self-consciousness, "*the personare*" of the universe of being. The periphery may be infinite *and* finite, absolute and relative, as said, the Lord is the personal centre: the central Sun that rules all; the source of life,—power—light and love. The momenta of the God-consciousness within us, answering to the divine attributes, as they are revealed to us in God's works and in His inspired Word, come to a full reconciliation in Christ's Person. In the interests of theological science we may make distinctions—and call these momenta by different names: we may speak of the divine omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence; of the divine truthfulness, holiness, justice, righteousness, goodness, and so on to the end of a chapter either long or short, as theologians choose to make it. But in the Lord the attributes are all one. The divisions and distinctions pass away; they are not. He is the all-powerful, all-wise, and everywhere-present One. He is the Truthful, Holy, Just, Righteous, and Good One.

We cannot properly conceive, therefore, that God can be in conflict with Himself—that certain of His attributes, His justice and holiness for instance, have certain unsettled claims that must be satisfied by other attributes, infinite truthfulness and love. Can God be hostile to God? No inspired Scripture, fairly interpreted, can convey such idea.

In the personal creature, in man is the conflict: here is the enmity—the hostility—the alienation. Here sin has done its dreadful work, and has brought its curse upon our very earth. But what is the attitude in which God stands to even our fallen and estranged world? Is He hostile to it? Is His mind enmity against man, as the carnal mind is enmity against Him? He hates sin; He cannot look upon it with the least favor, just because He is the Holy One. Yet He is not hostile to man, or the world. "God so *loved* the world as to give His Only Begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him might not perish, but have everlasting life."

"God is in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself." Such reconciliation is objectively present in Christ, "who has become the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world." He is the atoning sacrifice for sin, and He makes the sacrifice. It is availing and efficacious because it has all the *momenta* of acceptable offering in absolute perfection. The divinely instituted type referred to is a dim and faint shadow of the glorious reality. The spotless lamb is a fit emblem of sinlessness and innocence; but He who is its antitype is the personal glory of the absolute holiness. Though this glory was veiled in the flesh in the servant form of existence during the state of His humiliation on earth, yet its overshadowing power was felt even by His enemies. Not only from the lips of Pilate do we hear the words: "I find no fault in this man," and again, "Behold the man;" but from the lips of the unchristian world generally do we receive the testimony, and hear the acknowledgments that "Jesus was a good man." That acknowledged, then, as a consequence, His deity is confessed; because He claimed to be

God, which He could not do consistently with innocency, if He is not God. But no argument is needed on this point. The life of our blessed Saviour, from the manger to the cross, is the indisputable evidence of the fact that He was innocent, holy, harmless and separate from sinners. The sins of the world were made over to Him, not by the symbolical laying on of hands, not outwardly, but by a real inward life imputation in virtue of His personal union with humanity. He was not *a* man merely; He was *the* man. We cannot say, "*Hominem assumpsit*," but we must say with all orthodox Christendom, "*Humanitatem assumpsit*." He is the second Adam. The real generic head, consequently the representative, of the human family. Thus, "He who knew no sin, became sin for us."

Then the Lamb, our real passover, was slain. Christ was crucified: His blood was actually shed. "God the mighty Maker died, for man, the creature's sin." Third essential of availing sacrifice. Did God then really suffer? The Lord, He is God. Did He really become incarnate? Was He born? Then He also suffered and died. Cold and freezing is the teaching, we will not say of theology, for the *theos* is not in it, which denies the sympathy of the divine with the human. Is not God really a person? "O yes, He has reason and will in essential unity;" that is conceded. But has He not also a heart, to love, to pity and to sympathize with His creatures made in His image and likeness? It has been beautifully said that the love of God to our world, in Christ, is like the broad, deep ocean in its relation to the waters that empty into it. It has the great tide, peculiarly its own, at the same time it has a gentle receptive tide answering to the gurgling flow of every estuary, and river, and creek, and rivulet, whose waters touch its waters.

The figure, though beautiful, is an illustration only in part. It means to say that the infinite love of God responds gently and tenderly to every love-current from the human heart that seeks to commingle with it. But why is this so? Whence are the estuaries, the rivers, and rivulets, whose waters are con-

tinually flowing towards the ocean and the sea? They seem to come from the mountain's side, and from the hill's side, or from the living rock deep down in the earth; but, in fact, they are *from* the oceans and seas, whence they were sent out in the form of mist, vapor, and cloud, to water the thirsty land. Hence, their natural course is toward their native home. So with the shoreless ocean of the Divine love; it sends down continually upon our world its refreshing showers, and the fountains which it opens up in the depths of the human heart, naturally send their streams back whence they came. Thus the great heart of God, Our Father in heaven, is one, in love and sympathy, with the heart of man.

This unity we have in Christ, our Lord, God's Son. He is the supreme delight, yea, the very heart of God, and the chief delight, the only true heart of man. In Christ God first loves us. He gives Himself and all things to us, according to the immutable love-law of sacrifice or offering. Then as a consequence, in Christ, we love God, and give ourselves to Him as living sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving. The God-heart in Christ and the human heart are one, as the divine and human natures are *one* in His person. That is the heart which was broken when Christ was crucified; and to that sacrifice, we think, the Psalmist had primary reference when he said: "A broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." To this, too, the Prophet Isaiah refers when he says: "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands." To that doubtless the significant expression alludes, "God so loved the world as to GIVE His Son;" that is, to give Him over to suffering and to death.

"O, for such love, let rocks and hills their lasting silence break,  
And all harmonious human tongues the Saviour's praises speak."

"O, the height, the depth, the length, and breadth of the love of God in Christ." But 'is death the termination of this won-

drous divine-human love-stream? Does the mystic river here flow under the ground never to re-appear? Is it suffering in itself considered, that completes the idea of atoning sacrifice? Was it the death of Christ as such that was so pleasing to God that He could ever after pardon men's sins on the condition of simple assent to the fact, and of a few penitential tears? Painfully unsatisfactory, and fearfully infidel producing is the thought. Under such view the atonement indeed finds no analogy in nature, and the questions must ever return to us for an answer: How can God punish the innocent one for the guilty: and how can He be just and the Justifier of them that believe? Even the corresponding view of the vicariousness of Christ's sacrifice does not help the matter. To be told that Christ died voluntarily, that He agreed with the Father to stand in the sinner's place, and to suffer the penalty of the law in his stead; and that God is willing, in virtue of the infinite merit and value of the substitution, to restore the penitent believer to favor, does not, and cannot, of itself effect a reconciliation. If that be the whole Gospel, then is its preaching vain, and our faith is also vain.

Not so did the Inspired Evangelists and Apostles apprehend the great reality. That is not the record of the former, nor is it the truth preached and taught by the latter. The Apostle Paul especially gloried in the cross, but not certainly as an instrument of death merely; not in the sense by any means that suffering *per se* has atoning merit. Not a word to that effect has dropped from the lips or pen of any one of the inspired writers. Those of them who witnessed the crucifixion scene, saw in that awful tragedy the death of all their hopes. All they could say was: "We had thought that this was He who was to come to redeem Israel." Poor disheartened disciples! There is no glorying in the crown now. But when they saw the mystic river, that had gone under ground re-appear, fuller, clearer, and stronger than ever before; when they came to apprehend the fact, as revealed by the miracles of the Resurrection, the Ascension, and Pentecost, that the crucifixion of the Son of

God was His actual coronation as "Lord of all," that the cross is at once His sceptre and His crown: when they saw in it the power of an endless life, then, and not till then, did they glory in the cross.

"The one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all," thus gave Himself "*to be testified in due time.*" (1 Tim. ii. 6, 7.) Hence "Christ and the Resurrection" is the theme of the Apostolic preaching, consequently of *all* evangelical preaching, according to the Lord's own words: "I am the resurrection and the life." He is the resurrection from the dead, and the life of the Church, His body, born on the day of Pentecost.

This is sufficiently clear that the wondrous love-law of atoning sacrifice does not come to its final fulfilment in the slaying of the Lamb of Calvary, or in the death of the cross.

The Lamb of Calvary is the Lamb of God—seen to be alive after it was slain; seen by the seer of the new covenant, in heaven, the very heart of God. Its blood consequently ever flows. That is the life, the love of God, and that is the reason it "cleanses from all sin." And that is obviously the reason why we are taught in the language of inspiration that God redeemed the Church with His own blood.

The crucifixion, under this view, is the birth-throe of the new creation, which comes to its complete cosmical order and form, by the Spirit's moving upon the waters of the mysterious deep, just as in the case of the first creation.

By the overshadowing of the Spirit, we must remember, the Son of God became the Son of Man. By the Spirit and water He was baptized. By the Spirit He was anointed to the three-fold office of Prophet, Priest and King. In the Spirit He fulfills this three-fold office in His teachings, in His sacrificial offerings, and in His triumphs over death and hades. Thus, as the Spirit's power, He returned to earth as He had promised, on the day of Pentecost, to unfold His theanthropic fulness historically in His Kingdom, now at hand, or in the Church which is His body.

Now we must have clearly seen, that in the natural creation,

and in the law of its being, the law of sacrifice is identical with the divine creative power. So in the New Creation in Christ Jesus we have the full and complete revelation of this same law. The same Lord by whose word the heavens were made, and the host of them, now creates the new heavens and the new earth. [Com. Ps. xxxiii. 6, Eph. iii. 9, Isa. lxxv. 17.] Yet there are not two creations side by side. Were that the case, the new could not actualize the idea of the atonement as present in the old. The natural everywhere looks to the supernatural, which takes it up, by its new creative powers, into its own sphere, and permeates it with its own life. The new creation is the old made new, as before said. This consequently is the "Supreme fact of the atonement." It is the final result, and ultimate consequence of vicarious sacrifice. We cannot conceive at all that the fact can hold, except in the Person of Christ, in and by and through whom are all things. In Him alone, who is Head over all things, does our central idea, which is as broad and deep as universal being, come to its full and complete actualization.

This all-comprehensive and momentous fact thus apprehended, gives us an entirely different answer to the question, "How can God be just, and yet the justifier of him that believeth?" from that outward, forensic view to which we have referred. The whole Christ is, in the language of St. Paul, "made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and complete redemption." There is no calculation needed with reference to the amount of debt that may be covered, or cancelled, and the value of the ransom price paid down. No speculation is needed as to how the blood of the atonement can quench the burning flames of the divine wrath against sin. No mere outward imputation of righteousness is called for, which is to be worn as a garment; and no estimate need be made as to its value. That is all in vain.

"Who of God is MADE unto us:" that indicates plainly enough that the law of sacrifice as actualized in the objective atonement, also works as *creative* power in the domain of human



life. In Christ we are *new creatures*: "Old things have passed away, behold, all things have become new." Hence the law of sacrifice is the law of the new creation, in us as well as out of us. There is no proposition more demonstrable than the fact that Christianity is the constant repetition of Christ's life in humanity. Hence such declarations as these: "He that would save his life shall lose it, and he that would lose his life shall find it;" "If any man would be My disciple let him deny himself, take up his cross, and follow Me," &c. As Christ went to heaven by the way of Calvary, so must every Christian. "No cross no crown." But to deny one's self, to suffer: who can become reconciled to that? who can be one with Christ in His humiliation unto death, even the death of the cross? The true answer is in the very nature of the law of love now under review. St. Paul explains its nature and its power. 2 Cor. v. 14, 15. "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if One died for all, THEN ALL DIED (not were all dead;) and that He died for all, that they which live should henceforth not live unto themselves, but unto Him who died for them, and rose again." There is the philosophy of the mystery. When Christ died, humanity died in, and with Him; so that His death is vicarious in a twofold sense; namely, in this, that He did the will of the Father, and in this, that He died as the true vicar of man. But the last essential prerequisite of the sacrifice that God does not despise, as clearly indicated by the Apostle, here authenticates itself as real. The risen and exalted Christ gives us His flesh to eat and His blood to drink. Baptized, by the Spirit, into His death, we come forth with Him from the grave to a new life. And just because He lives in us, or is formed in us the hope of glory, do we henceforth not live unto ourselves, but unto Him, who died for us and rose again. He is in us, we in Him. Thus the law of sacrifice, the divine love-law, culminates in the most intimate and blessed sacramental union and communion of man with God. It is that love of Christ that constrains, that reconciles, us to Him, to our environments, to our duties, and to ourselves. We mean

the communion love as we have it revealed in the dispensation of the Spirit, who moves upon the waters of the Sanctuary—and whose sphere of saving power is in the Church as the complex of the divinely ordained means of grace. This is the form in which Christ is present alway with His disciples, “even unto the end of the world.” All these means of grace centering in the sacrament of baptism, and the eucharist which unfolds the life, signified and sealed by “the washing of regeneration,” partake of a sacramental character; and they are no less essential than the outward and visible in the natural creation. They are essential and necessary because we live in the world of sense as well as in the world of spirit; and because all relative life must be nourished that it may unfold its nature and reach ultimately its ideal.

But to say nothing of the divinely ordained sacraments as holy, visible signs and seals of the invisible grace; to look away from the outward form to the real presence of the Lord by the Spirit, is there nothing in that, nothing in the fulness and glory of His divine human love, to bind us and all men, as by a sacrament, a solemn oath, to Him and to His service? Let our religion be spiritual, then, most intensely spiritual, only don't take from it its reality—and it binds us to God, in body, soul, and spirit, nevertheless: consequently it is sacramental. We conclude, therefore, that sacrament perpetuates sacrifice, and that it is the very spirit and form, the uniting bond of the atonement; the great centripetal law in virtue of which all bodies, celestial and terrestrial, impersonal and personal, are kept in their proper orbits, and revolve around their centre Sun—Christ.

## ART. VIII.—EUROPEAN RULE IN THE ORIENT.

---

BY REV. I. E. GRAEFF.

---

ONE of the most intensely practical questions of our age is that of government. It forces itself vigorously into all the relations of society; and it is now of an especially vital and serious character, because it deals so directly with the personal and general interests of mankind. The individual is stimulated to a most positive self-assertion, and the guaranteed security of national independence is peremptorily maintained as a fundamental norm of international jurisprudence. We are rapidly approaching a state of the popular will which forbids conquest for the sake of self-aggrandizement, and which makes the causes of war and of political intervention and supremacy a subject of rigid investigation. Governments are thus compelled to rise to the level of an enlightened and generous economy, to afford ample protection to the possession and development of individual and national resources, and to guarantee unmolested freedom to the internal affairs of independent Powers.

It would, however, be impolitic to regard the law of non-intervention as absolute and unconditional. No government is possible on the basis of mere negative absolutism, and the interests of international amity and progress lie largely in the direction of a rational freedom. Hence a normal balance of power involves a pliable organic law, competent to meet all the emergencies of history in a rational way. The progress of the race must go forward under rules and regulations, less arbitrarily fixed than the laws of the Medes and Persians. Individual and national rights must be secured, not only as a matter

of common justice, but as a fundamental condition of the general good; but just so must personal and corporate prerogatives be limited for the purposes of the same general end. If the principle of non-intervention would be rigidly enforced in all cases where political supremacy is not introduced and exercised with the free and voluntary consent of the governed, European rule would have to cease in the Orient, and the risk would have to be taken to see modern civilization there retarded centuries in its progress. With all our love of untrammelled freedom, and our traditional devotion to the doctrine of non-interference, we shall never be able to bring ourselves down to an international policy which runs so directly in the face of the progressive genius of our age.

England and Russia are the two Western nations which are directly responsible, at the bar of public opinion, for the exercise of political power in the East. They have both taken possession of vast territories of the Eastern Continent, and have established their governments there, without the voluntary consent of the people; and it is therefore a question on what principle of international law their forced dominion can be justified. Had the Tartar tribes of Turkestan, or the races of India, been able to maintain strong and efficient government for the purposes of internal tranquillity and external amity and peace, those sections would not now be under the rule of foreign Powers. But the section now ruled by the Czar had no government but that of barbarian caprice; and on the sunny plains of Hindustan the power of the great Moguls was broken, and her population of two hundred millions was at the mercy of endless and hopeless political disorganization. In this way it was made possible and necessary for the Western Powers to step in and assume the reins; and, judged in the light of all the circumstances, the measure must be regarded as decidedly beneficial to the subjugated Orientals. This, we think, can be made clear by an impartial consideration of the results that have already come from the transfer of political power, and the sway of modern deas. Much depends, of course, on the spirit of the two re-

presentative governments as to whether the high hopes of the Christian world, relative to the regeneration of the East, will be realized. One of these, it is well known, is much further advanced in liberal ideas and manners than the other; yet both of them have erected the tribunals of law, restored order, secured safety of person and property, protected and developed the cultivation of the soil, encouraged trade and commerce, and introduced the various agencies of material and social progress, all of which gives them a presumptive right to the position which they have taken.

The British in India have put into successful operation the machinery of a fully organized government, which is as prompt and as effective as the home government itself. Those who are in a condition to know from personal observation, declare emphatically that it is conducted with direct and constant reference to the good of the people, striving earnestly to advance the prosperity and happiness of the natives. Hence extensive public improvements are undertaken for the purpose of irrigation. Millions of acres have thus been brought under cultivation, and agriculture has received a new impulse which may yet tell largely on the destiny of the country. The sacred waters of the Ganges are now made to contribute to the preservation of life, instead of serving the ends of a dark and cruel superstition, and the waters of other streams are also brought under the control of the same generous policy. Lands are not suffered to lay waste for want of encouragement to make them productive, as has been the case under the misrule of former princes, and in this way one of the fundamental defects of Eastern society is corrected. The British Indian authorities are fully conscious of the fact that, without agricultural thrift and industry, their Eastern empire must be a failure, since Oriental stagnation cannot be removed, and the regeneration of society secured, without this powerful stimulant to intellectual and moral energy. It has not yet come so clearly to light what Russia is doing, but, as she is one of the great grain-growing countries, it may be taken for granted that the tillage of the soil and the raising

of crops in her broad Eastern domain is not a matter of indifference to her. She has taught the wild, warring, plundering, semi-nomad tribes and khanates of Central Asia the rudiments of organized government, and of the arts of peace. Her operations there are of great importance to the civilization of our age. Before she occupied the country it was kept in perpetual turmoil by the robber tribes of the natives, and neither agriculture, trade, nor commerce could be developed. But as she pushed her outposts into that region, these barbaric amusements were promptly interfered with, and the rules of order enforced; and thus the people are drawn together by common laws, and consolidated into a nation with a close communion of speech, public opinion, religion, and political interests. All this is a guarantee that Muscovite supremacy in the Orient is exercised in the interest of the native population, and that it is entitled to our respect and sympathy as a significant part of the humane cosmopolitan tendency of modern politics.

If, then, the axe is laid at the root of Oriental indolence and social misery by the revival of civil power and agricultural industry and thrift, as these things are made to prosper under the fostering care of European rule, this alone would be sufficient to justify the measure of intervention. But the work is scarcely yet begun. Many of the most fertile regions of the Eastern Continent lie waste, or are but poorly cultivated; and if left to themselves, the Eastern peoples will hardly bring about a change. But Western enterprise and capital will do the work, if the necessary protection is afforded. Hence it may become necessary, in the interests of the times, that European rule should become even more general and more potent in the Orient than it is at present. If the peoples of that section will rise to a sense of what is wanted in the progress of the race, as Japan has done, they can be safely left to manage their own domestic affairs; should they, however, persist in resisting the progressive demands of modern civilization with characteristic stupidity, then it will be easily seen that a little more coercion, coming from the civilized quarters of the Occident, would be a

very God-send both to them and to the best interests of the world at large. It is not necessary, on this account, to maintain that nothing has happened in the conquest and rule of Eastern countries, or is likely to happen hereafter in the progress of European supremacy, of which the natives have a just right to complain. Such a paradisaical flow of human events is not to be looked for anywhere in this sin-stricken world. Had British rule in India been altogether just and beneficent, during the reign of the East India Company, the terrible Sepoy rebellion of 1857-58 would hardly have taken place. To the credit of the English people, it must be said that, as soon as the cause of that barbarous and bloody struggle was understood by them, they demanded that the corporate rights of the gigantic and unscrupulous monopoly which represented their government in the Hindu peninsula should be recalled, and the home government assume the reins instead. Since that day the policy of English rule is applauded by leading natives, and the races of Hindustan are rising under its generous sway in all the elements of a happy and prosperous nationality.

But European Powers do not stop at mere government and earth-culture, in the regions of the Orient. They carry with them, as they go, the material improvements and appliances in the production of which modern genius is so prolific. Railroads, and the electric telegraph, and steam navigation, are made the strong arms of our Western supremacy. And in this respect also the Russian government is not far behind her powerful European rival in Central Asia.

British rule and capital have covered the broad territory of Hindustan with a complete net-work of railroads. Five or more thousand miles of rail have already been laid, and the laying of more is still in progress. From Bombay to Calcutta, and from the surf of Cape Comorin to the shadow of the Himalayas, the facilities of modern commerce and travel are at hand. It is hardly necessary to suggest, to the intelligent reader, that the internal development of the country is thus advanced centuries at a leap, and the means furnished for a speedy and radical



revolution in Hindu society. The various castes must commingle in the cars and on steamers. Telegraphic wires are the bearers of messages, and, in government hands, the guardians of peace. The people travel, they meet, they think. Thus the icy barriers of caste will gradually melt away, the races of India will be made more homogeneous, and the grand Aryan nationality of the peninsula will flourish as the majestic and graceful palm of her native soil. And, besides, Russia is reaching out from St. Petersburg and Moscow towards the Himalaya range, and will soon be ready to join her iron highways with those of British India. Two-thirds of the distance between Great Britain and her Eastern possessions is already covered with iron rails, and Russian authority on the immense steppes of Turkestan is capable of closing the gap, and making the circuit complete. At no very distant day the round-the-world tourist may take the cars at Calais or Constantinople and reach Calcutta without change of cars; or he may start on Cape Comorin and reach the Muscovite capital, across Central Asia, in the same way. Along these iron highways, connected with the commercial and intellectual centres of modern society, intelligence, culture, and religion, will run out to the ends of the earth, and modern civilization will become mistress of the world. The false systems of the East must give way under this combined pressure from the West, and enter into the flow of that life which is come to give light to all the world.

But this is not all. We must rise by degrees to a full survey of the world-historical movement with which we are trying to become familiar.

English rule is doing a work of sublime importance in India, by introducing the broad and liberal educational appliances of European culture. The government is founding schools, academies, and colleges, and is earnestly endeavoring to advance general intelligence among the native population. Religious and benevolent organizations are ardently engaged in the same work, and wealthy natives catch the spirit of this educational enthusiasm, and spend their means freely in establishing and

supporting schools and institutions of learning, instead of erecting shrines and temples in the service of a degrading superstition. The education of both sexes is thus properly provided for, and the culture of the Indo-Germanic race is made to take a new start on the basis of European ideas. Besides, the journalistic enterprise of the age is brought to bear on the Hindu masses. More than four hundred periodicals of various kinds circulate among them, one-half of which are edited in the languages of the people, and the other half either in the English, or in both the English and the vernacular. In this way the leading topics of the day are kept before the popular mind, and the mental stupor of the country, so long in force, is receiving a peaceful shock. Thus Hindustan is being lifted to the high level of European thought and manners, and placed on the highway of social and political prosperity. It is not to be expected, as a matter of course, that Orientals, either in India or elsewhere, will ever be made mentally or otherwise, all that is distinctive of Western life and culture. As well might we change the climatic and botanic peculiarities of the Orient into those of the Occident and metamorphose the graceful palm into the sturdy oak, as make the Eastern mind and culture fully answer to our Western model. But for all this the Oriental mind is not necessarily inferior, for all the generous purposes of modern civilization. If it is less logically strong and clear than that of our Anglo-Germanic non-emotional nature, it is largely endowed with powers of a clear understanding, and with a feminine grace and ardor, which, joined to a vivid imagination, fit it particularly for a comprehensive appropriation of the best elements of modern culture. And as India was the source of Oriental learning throughout the long ages of antiquity; has produced a language which, in grammatical construction, philosophic depth, and poetical elasticity and beauty, is not inferior to the best produced by the Aryan stock in any part of the world; and in her literature has contributed much to art, science, ethics, and religion; we may reasonably hope that Anglican

rule and vigor will revive the old intellectual fire and bring the regenerated masses of the great Mogul empire into the very front of modern progress.

Here we are confronted with the proverbial immobility and fossilization of Oriental races, and the question presents itself, how such high hopes of a sure and radical revival can be entertained in the face of such discouraging experience in the past. Yet, the difficulty, it seems to us, is easily solved. Religion was the incubus that brooded like a night-mare over the Oriental mind. It prescribed, with all the sanctions of a divine original, every law, custom, and ordinance of society; forbade change; stamped progress as innovation; and commanded the people ever to look backward instead of forward for the golden age. Had those benighted races been led by the voice of ancient Hebrew prophecy and come into the vital current of Christian life, they would not have remained stationary while the rest of the world were marching on. But this grand evil is now being disposed of, the old traditional chains are breaking, and the new inspiration needed is coming back from the West whither it had fled from the deluded regions of the East. And these evangelistic ideas, returning in this way to the land from which they came, carry with them the increased force of the comprehensive experience and enterprise of the times, which makes them irresistible wherever they are allowed to have free scope. European rule in the Orient, as we have seen, is the guarantee of this, and therefore we confidently look for the coming of an era of mental and moral awakening among the countless millions of the Eastern continent, such as has not yet been witnessed in the historical movements of that part of the world.

All the benefits of European supremacy are due, ultimately, to the Christian faith. This was at the bottom of Western progress ever since it found its way into Europe, and gave shape and character to both social and political economy. Our philosophy, art, science, and morality, are the offspring of this creative power that lies back of them, and they can never di-

vest themselves of the native versatility and cosmopolitan genius which come to them by this spiritual parentage. And it matters not what the motives may have been that led to the introduction of European rule in the East—the movement is made to carry with it a regenerating energy which is above all individual design or political selfishness. In spite of any drawbacks of this kind, the door has been opened wide to the same evangelistic economy from the prolific womb of which sprung the ideas, institutions, and usages of modern times, and in the course of which society is making such immense strides in the arts of a truly civilized life. Under British rule the secular advance of the age is not only made to tell in Hindustan, but the Gospel has free course also. The number of native Christians is said to be between two and three hundred thousand, and the number is increasing gradually by the missionary efforts of various Christian organizations. Large sections of the peninsula are reported as being ready for the introduction of our faith, if only we furnish the men and the means required to do the work. It is evident that Hindu culture and religion must fall before the advance of European knowledge. Hence western supremacy must do more for that country, than the mere materialism and intellectual resources of our civilization can afford. It will not do to make those ardent Orientals a horde of irreligious, scoffing infidels, or heartless atheists; neither are they willing to be led in any such downward course. They are falling in with our educational schemes, but they demand that these shall not be divorced from the sacred guardianship of religion, whether this be Pagan or Christian. India is to have our culture in the full breadth of its meaning, but she is to have along with this what is fundamental to all world-historical progress—the knowledge and power of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Thus her superstitions, her absurdities of science and religion, her false and iron caste system, ethical abnormities, and political degradation, can be successfully removed and superseded by the higher order of our better life. And as this grand scheme of social

and moral regeneration is already in process of development, and has already met with a very encouraging degree of success; and as the Indo-Germanic tribes are found capable of the most generous culture and advancement, we feel justified in believing that British rule is a providential necessity in the regeneration of that country, and that the dawn of a glorious future for it is now looming up above the horizon. But of course the conversion of these peoples will not necessarily transmute them into the same style of Christians we find ourselves to be. Oriental piety, as well as Oriental intellectual and social culture, will have its own peculiar types and character—it will never be an exact reproduction of the same order of life with us. If it be less dogmatic, dialectic, systematic, and clear in its theological mannerism; it will likely be much more emotional, graceful, ardent, and practical, than is common to the masculine habits of modern nationalities. Perhaps a Christianized and regenerated Orient is just what is needed to complement our Western civilization, and to give it that full roundness and versatility which shall characterize the perfection of the millennial glory of the race.

Japan entered into a treaty with the United States in 1854, a few months later in the same year with Great Britain and Treaties with other European Powers gradually followed, until now that Islandish empire of the far distant Orient is in hearty commercial and intellectual accord with the progressive genius of our modern world. This radical change in her foreign policy is not due to European supremacy, in the direct sense heretofore considered. It comes rather as the choice fruit of our own more advanced American policy, which has been reached in accordance with the famous Monroe doctrine. Japan is allowed her full freedom and independency as a nation. She maintains her own government, and manages her internal affairs; yet she opens her gates wide to all the elements of our civilization, and is rapidly progressing in the arts of modern life. All this may be taken as a standing protest against foreign intervention, in the European manner. There

is, however, no rule without its exceptions. The people of Japan are neither Mongole nor Malay, but, as may be supposed, a blending of these two cardinal races. They speak a language different from those of all other Orientals, excepting one; and there may be something in their native genius and in the force of circumstances incidental to their recent measures, which fits them specifically for the advanced position they now occupy. At any rate the great Chinese empire has not yet become willing to follow in the footsteps of its near neighbor, in the introduction of modern ideas and improvements; and it would hardly be wise to allow the Tartars of Turkestan and the Hindus of India to try their own hands at independent action, at this stage of their rising nationalities. Strong governments are needed, with broad and liberal ideas, which the Eastern dependencies of European Powers do not have or are able to produce. Hence foreign rule must be suffered to do its work until such time as will find the natives capable of placing themselves side by side with the independent nations of the age, and secure to themselves and to the world the benefits of their European training.

European rule in the Orient, as thus presented, may be regarded as the great Eastern question in the broadest sense. It is infinitely more significant and far-reaching than any schemes that have ever entered into European politics or diplomacy. It involves the political, social and moral regeneration of the countless millions, scattered over the length and breadth of the Asiatic continent. Hence whatever has a bearing on the present status of affairs, no matter in what way this comes to view, properly claims our attention as a matter of serious importance. We cannot, therefore, be indifferent to the issues of the Russo-Turkish war now in progress, since it transpires in the pathway of Oriental destiny. Whatever may be our opinion of the sincerity of the Czar in making the protection of the members of the Greek Church in the empire of the Sultan, the ostensible cause of this war, we cannot help feeling that in this the Muscovite emperor is the champion of

modern ideas against the barbarous cruelty of the sublime Porte. The struggle is a clash of civilizations, and involves interests vital to the progress of the race. Turkey is the representative of a civilization which is clearly out of date in the circles of modern politics, and it is felt to be a monstrous abnormality in the reigning genius of European life. The day is fully come, we have reason to believe, when governments will be made to feel that relentless fanatical hate and religious bigotry and persecution cannot be indulged with impunity, and without being challenged at the bar of public opinion. Here we are reminded, of course, that Russia herself has made but little advance in the matter of religious toleration, and that it is therefore with doubtful propriety that she puts herself forward as the defender of religious freedom. Still, as far as principle is concerned, she is right in her demands and deserves the sympathies of the Christian world; and as she is a young nationality, just emerging out of barbarism, and has within her own civilization all the elements of modern progress, it may be taken for granted that she will hardly remain stationary in the nobler tendencies of the Christian life, in spite of the demands that will be made upon her and the lessons that she ought to learn from the *causus belli* which she has announced to the world for going into the hard and bloody struggle which now so severely tries her strength.

The Ottoman empire gained her foothold in Europe by barbaric violence, and she has ruled over the fairest portion of that continent with an iron rod. Her supremacy came in, no doubt, as a chastisement of a corrupt Christianity, and though it was a fearful scourge, it was perhaps beneficial in its day, and a necessity in European political power. But that day is evidently passed, and the issues of the times demand a change. Turkey is unfitted, by all the traditional forces of her civilization, to occupy the position she now holds. She can never rise to the ideal of Christian civilization and fall in heartily with the progressive tendencies of the age. She must and will hold on to the antiquated notions of Oriental life, and act upon



the principle of a *jure divino* absolutism. All her absurd traditions and usages, both in social and political economy, are fixed by the sanctions of her religion, and must therefore remain unchanged. She has indeed yielded to the pressure of material improvement, but only in a very partial way. She has done little or nothing to advance the tillage of her soil, and to develop and improve the material resources of her people. She has failed to secure the blessings of good government, and has been either too indolent or too weak to stop the marauding habits of a large portion of her population. She has had but little concern about the education of her masses, and, as a matter of course, has done nothing for the education and elevation of the female sex. The sultan finds it more to his taste, generally, to squander millions upon his imperial household, and seraglios and harems, than to manage the affairs of his realm with an enlightened view to the popular and beneficent ends and aims of modern government. His pashas and minor princes run with him on this same antiquated level, and hence Oriental stagnation characterizes his rule throughout the borders of his jurisdiction. And this is the Sublime Porte, which is riding on the Golden Horn of the Bosphorus and stands guard on the Dardanelles!

It is hazardous to act the part of a prophet, when one has not been specifically called to that high and responsible position. Still the light of history and the shadow of passing events may perhaps give us the key to what will soon come to pass. We know not what the more local and partisan issues may be, to which the Eastern war may lead; but we should not be at all surprised if the Turkish Power would soon be relieved from the business of presiding over any of the great nautical highways of the nations. It seems to us that at least that much is clearly foreshadowed by the prevailing posture of affairs. The humor of the times seems to indicate that the safety of neighboring powers must be secured by other means than throwing arbitrary obstacles in the way of national strength, and retarding the movements of universal progress. The hour is come when

the civilized world will rise to a higher ideal of international law, and will give free scope to the cosmopolitan tendencies of modern civilization. If the statecraft of Europe is equal to this sublime task, the Russo-Turkish conflict, now dragging its weary course along on two continents, will cause no serious inconvenience to European rule in the Orient, and will aid instead of retard the general progress of liberal ideas. Neither Slavonic nor British supremacy in the East will likely be disturbed, and both will go on side by side in ruling and elevating the vast multitudes of Central Asia, at least until their Western guardianship has done its proper work, and their Oriental dominions are ready to fall back into native hands.

But if this is the high level to which European politics will be compelled to rise in the settlement of the great Eastern question, then what shall the churches do?

We have already called attention to the fact that European civilization is due to Christianity, and that modern culture has received its distinctive economic peculiarities from the presence and power of the Christian faith in the history of European nations. Now, if we had not the Apostolic commission to go into all the world and make all nations disciples, there would still be a powerful incentive to the churches and Christian communities of the West to organize for the most comprehensive missionary efforts among the benighted millions of the East, at this juncture of world-historic events. It seems to us that the mere prospect of making our civilization a universal world-power, without any specific sense of its divine character and aim in the destiny of immortal souls and of the race, would be grand enough to arouse and enlist all the slumbering energies of the churches to the great work of universal Christianization. The mere idea of having our culture, laws, manners, and institutions recognized and established as answering best to the race as a whole, is certainly worthy the enthusiasm of the times; and if it is indeed true that now we have reached a point, in the onward progress of the race, when such a world-historic scheme for the universal supremacy of our civilization is clearly

possible and necessary, then it would be singular if our boasted European intellectual superiority could not grasp the issue and rise to a clear sense of the significance of our mission.

The question, for the Christian mind, does however not hinge upon such mere humanitarian principles and aims, though these be ever so inspiring and noble. The Apostolic commission to the Church is the voice of God in behalf of perishing millions. If, therefore, in the fulness of time the door is providentially opened for fulfilling the divine call, by the destruction and removal of the powers and the prejudices which previously stood in the way, should not then the Church move as an army terrible with banners in her grand efforts to make all the world disciples? The missionary spirit is a necessary condition of the Christian life, and no healthy state of Church-life can exist where this spirit is not properly at work. If the love of Christ does not constrain His people to labor with earnestness and devotion for the conversion of men at home and abroad, then surely they must be afflicted with a stupor that is worse and more inexcusable than that which is brooding over the pagan mind of the Orient.

Modern history has been largely characterized by intense theological controversy, and frequent ecclesiastical divisions. Perhaps this must be taken as a necessary phase of the historical development of the Christian faith, and the progress of the kingdom of God in the world. The present crisis seems, however, to require measures a great deal more practical and direct than the perpetual discussion of theses for the purpose of serving the ends of rigid orthodoxy. It is sad, truly, that those particularly who stand on the same confessional basis, and do only hold different types of theological opinion, do so often spend their time and energy in theological strife, while they neglect the crying demands for organization and practical work. Evangelical purity of doctrine and of traditional usages is not to be underrated in the estimation of the Christian world; but if this one interest usurps all the rights and powers of the economy to which it belongs, there is a call for a change and reformation.

Our age is noted for its immense practical energy, and for its broad combinations for general ends; wherefore we may well hope that the churches will not fall behind in the magnitude of their work.

We are told that an attempt was made to establish purely secular schools in India, and that the natives would not support them. They will have their children educated religiously, and many of them will allow this to be done in the Christian faith. In this they evince a keen sense of the vital relation of religion to the welfare of society, and are wiser than their teachers. To their mind the salvation of the race does not lie in the direction of a bald, frigid and skeptical intellectualism. They accept our civilization, but not without its fountal source and power; they will receive our intellectual culture, but not without the culture of the will and of the heart under the sanction of our holy religion. Just this is the golden fringe of the silver lining now tinting the horizon of the Orient, and casting its bright shadow into the future of the world's progress. Were we as decidedly religious, in connection with our intellectual mannerism, as these Orientals are, the triumphs of our civilization would be more speedy, and the final problems of the history of the race would soon be solved. We trust that European supremacy in the Orient will lead to this world-historical result, and that all the nations of the earth will soon be united in the bonds of one life and one faith.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

---

THE FINAL PHILOSOPHY, OR SYSTEM OF PERFECTIBLE KNOWLEDGE  
ISSUING FROM THE HARMONY OF SCIENCE AND RELIGION. By Charles  
Woodruff Shields, D. D., Professor in Princeton College. Member of the  
American Philosophical Society. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co.  
1877.

FROM the preface of this work we learn that "the author, in the year 1861, issued a brief essay entitled *Philosophia Ultima*, together with a corresponding scheme of academic studies; and in pursuance of that scheme, in the year 1865, a chair of instruction was secured in the College of New Jersey, through the generous and intelligent sympathy of some friends in Philadelphia, of whom should here be named the late Rev. Doctor William M. Engles, Mr. George W. Childs, Mr. Anthony J. Drexel, and the Hon. Furman Shepard. The present volume may be regarded as the first-fruits of an educational experiment thus begun, and for a time successfully pursued." The closing chapter of the book contains so much of the original essay as remains to be expanded; "while the completion of the final philosophy itself, it need scarcely be said, can only be the work of many minds through coming generations."

This work is important, not only for what it is in itself considered, but because it may be regarded as representative of a large portion of the thinking of the present day on the subject which it treats, and also because it stands in some sense as representing the position of PRINCETON COLLEGE, if not the Princeton Institutions. Just as a theological work from one of the professors in the Theological Seminary at Princeton would be regarded as representing the theology of that institution, in one or another of its phases, so this work represents the position of the College; and as it treats of a subject which links the College and Seminary together it may be presumed to speak for both. It is not meant, of course, that in

institutions like those at Princeton the faculties are to be held responsible for every view in science or theology that may be entertained or published by one of the professors; but the case before us is somewhat different from that. Here is a department or chair specially endowed for the purpose of instructing the students on the subject of the relation of science and religion. The professor occupying that chair published his theory before he was called to the professorship. It was therefore known to the faculties and authorities of the institutions beforehand. It is now elaborated and sent out to the world as it has been taught for years. It is a department which forms a connecting link between the College and the Seminary, and may be regarded as setting forth the internal relation holding between what is taught in both. In this view this work may be taken as the voice of both institutions at Princeton, and as carrying with it, to some extent, their *imprimatur*. To regard it otherwise, that is as not in harmony with the views of the presidents and faculties of those institutions, would imply a want of unity and positive confusion in the general results or outcome of the teaching there, which would place them in a rather unfavorable attitude before the public. We could not well imagine how either Dr. Hodge or Dr. McCosh could rest satisfied with the teaching of a chair in either institution which would inculcate in the minds of the students principles contrary to his own views on a subject so important and vital as the one here treated—the relation between science and religion. In our notice of this work, therefore, we regard it as setting forth, not only the views of Dr. Shields, which itself would be sufficient to entitle them to careful and serious attention, but as the teaching of *Princeton* on this important subject.

The greater portion of this work is occupied with a historical treatment of the conflict between science and religion. We have not had sufficient time as yet to examine and study this portion of the work to enable us to pronounce a judgement upon it in its details. It bears evidence of the author's careful study and ripe scholarship. The field is wide and interesting. Commencing with a brief review of the conflict in ancient times, the author gives an elaborate history of the warfare that has been waged in modern times, beginning with the literary contest between Christianity and heathenism in the Roman Empire, running on through the Middle

ages, and coming to its greatest struggle in the great systems of philosophy that have arisen since the Reformation. In this purely historical treatment of the subject, there is no field of study that presents more interest and profit. It has to do with the most vital topics of all history. It embraces indeed the deepest philosophy of history; for the main thread of history must be traced just along this line of warfare between the wisdom of man and the wisdom of God. The two factors of history, the divine and the human, are here constantly brought into view. Here are to be found the *arcana* of the world's historical life; for man's progress in true civilization on the one hand, or his lapse and deterioration on the other, is determined at every step by the degree of harmony that is reached and established between these two factors. The subject is thus clothed with the deepest interest when viewed merely from the stand-point of man's progress in civilization and culture.

So also it covers a field of most interesting inquiry and study for the theologian. It includes the department of Christian Apologetics. Christianity claims to be the revelation of absolute truth to the world. Its founder boldly declared, "I am the light of the world;" "I am the way, the truth, and the life." St. John says of Him, "In Him was life, and the life was the light of the world." He claimed to be God who created the universe. "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made." As the absolute truth in human form He claimed to be at the same time the source of all wisdom and the teacher of all wisdom. Christianity has claimed in His name, therefore, to teach infallible truth to the world, and hence all human science and philosophy must be judged by this standard. This claim has aroused a conflict, and it is the province of Apologetics to maintain the rights and prerogatives of revealed truth in relation to the wisdom of the world.

In its merely historical treatment therefore, the subject opens up a field of study of the most interesting character, well worthy of a special department both in a College and a Theological Seminary. And the author has shown his appreciation of its extended scope and deep importance in the elaborate manner in which he has treated it. It is true, his treatment involves a good deal of repetition. Tracing the conflict from age to age the same arguments on both sides come up repeatedly. It might be a question whether a



plan of treatment might not be adopted which would to some extent avoid such repetition. So also a criticism might be made on the author's style as being perhaps better adapted to a public lecture than to the class-room. For the purposes of the student it might be more condensed and concise. To illustrate this we select at random a paragraph at the opening of the chapter on page 27.

"At the close of our introduction we stood upon an imaginary eminence of faith and hope, overlooking the vast battle-field of modern philosophy. Resuming the figure, we purpose now to review the motley hosts which are there mustered; to point out the various standards under which they are marshalled; to trace their changing features over the field, as here they are seen closing in deadly grapple, or there resting idly upon their arms, or now rushing wildly in the charge, or anon trailing their banners in the dust; to show how the lines are forming for a last decisive struggle; and at length to gather against the charges of defeat, the sure presages of victory. In plainer words, the next few chapters will be devoted to a survey of the present state of parties in the philosophical world as to the great question of reconciling Science and Religion, with a glance at the prospects of their ultimate harmony." Our own taste in the treatment of a subject of this kind would be entirely satisfied and better pleased with the last sentences omitted. The author spends too much time as he goes along in continually telling us what he has done and what he is going to do, and his style would be improved, we think, by a more sparing use of adjectives. As a specimen of what rises nearly, if not quite, to grandiloquence, take the following from page 570.

"Then, too, may, even the celestial sciences begin to blossom with celestial arts that shall knit together, in spiritual sympathy, all celestial races. Terrene, solar, and stellar influences, wielded by human prowess and prayer, may unfold the commerce of heaven, the telegraph of the skies, and the worship of the one universal Father, until the ripe, scient earth echoes back the anthem that erst hailed her novitiate, when 'the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy.'" Well might he open the following paragraph with the exclamation,—*"At the height we have now reached, how wide the horizon! how grand the prospect!"* But these defects, if such indeed they really are (for tastes differ), are of trifling account as compared with the earnest, solid teaching of the work, which we now proceed to notice.

In what way are science and religion to be brought into harmony and the long conflict ended? That is the question which the writer proposes to answer. It was to give an answer to this question his chair in Princeton College was endowed by the liberal and intelligent Christian men in Philadelphia, who are named in the preface, and it is but natural that an interest should be felt by other literary and theological institutions, and throughout the country generally, as to the manner in which it is here answered. It is a question that vitally concerns all our education, for even though it may not be formally taught, yet every school and College must have and act on some theory in reference to this subject. We shall attempt first to state what the author's theory in regard to the relation between science and religion, and the method by which their agreement is to be reached, is, and then follow this with some remarks in the way of criticism.

After tracing the history of the conflict, the author, in taking a general survey of the situation at the present time, shows that the subject concerning which science and religion are in conflict belong partly to both, that they stand in part on common ground. While each has truths to declare which belong more specially to its own province, there are other truths which pertain to a province or territory that is common to both. The question then arises, who, or what, shall be the umpire to decide between them?

"Religion alone could not furnish the needed umpire. Concede to the utmost her high prerogatives; grant that she stands upon the authority of a divine revelation and that for its interpretation she has an equally divine illumination in the whole Church and in each believer; yet that revelation, by its own self-prescribed limits, is found to exclude her from the legitimate fields of science, and that illumination renders neither her public nor private judgment infallible in scientific researches," &c.

"Science alone could not furnish the needed umpire. Concede all that she can justly claim; grant that she proceeds upon a basis of facts and that her process is unerring in attaining actual knowledge; yet that knowledge, bounded as it is by the limits of reason, until supplemented by revelation, can never extend to the transcendental realms of religion," &c.

"Philosophy, at least, is the actual, the accepted umpire. The two parties have ever in fact, even though without concert, prac-

tically owned her jurisdiction, and sought to justify themselves to each other in her view . . . . Philosophy, too, is the only available umpire . . . . Philosophy, moreover, is the one desirable umpire."

The author then proceeds to point out the two extreme philosophical tendencies at the present day, the Positive Philosophy or theory of nescience as ignoring revelation, and the Absolute Philosophy or theory of omniscience as superseding revelation, and claims that they can be reconciled in an Ultimate Philosophy or theory of perfectible science as concurring with revelation. In an elaborate discussion he aims to show that the first claims too little and the second too much for the extent of human research and knowledge unaided by revelation. The conclusion reached is that science should contribute its part, and revelation its part, and philosophy then may construct a system of complete knowledge which shall respect the claims of each. They occupy different spheres of knowledge which are complementary, and therefore do not exclude each other, and as both pertain to the one universal realm of truth they should not contradict, but harmonize with each other. In the latter portion of the volume the author lays down a schedule of academic study which has this harmonization in view. The following, not to quote all, are some of the principles that are to govern the work of bringing the two into harmony: 1. "Hypotheses and dogmas are to be formed by the scientist and religionist independently, each in his own province, and by his own methods. 2. Dogmas within the province of the scientist must be tested in the same manner as his own hypotheses; and hypotheses within the province of the religionist, in the same manner as his own dogmas. 3. Conflicting hypotheses and dogmas may be provisionally adjusted by exhibiting the problems of opinion according as reason or revelation predominates in the normal scale of the sciences."

This will suffice, we think, to give the reader an idea of the principles that govern the author's theory or system. It is only with these we propose to deal in our remaining remarks by way of criticism. The book contains a great deal of information, and much may be learned by the student in the way of separate truths. But our inquiry pertains to the theory of the book as a whole. Is the author on the right track in seeking the reconciliation of science and religion? We think not, and for the following reasons:

I. The theory of reconciliation here proposed rests on the hypothesis that the truth of science and the truth of revelation are the same in kind, coördinate, and of equal certainty and authority so far as they go. Science leads us into the knowledge of a portion of the creation, but it is limited. Our knowledge is imperfect, not in kind but in extent. Some things lie beyond the reach of mere science, and these have been revealed to us in a supernatural way. This, if not asserted in so many words, is assumed all through the volume. It involves, we think, an error, which will appear more clearly when we come to consider some points that are to follow.

It ought to be clear that *this* is not the relation of the two kinds of knowledge—the two orders of truth. If scientific truth differs from revealed truth merely in the fact that it is limited in its extent, then science might claim, as it often does, that it only needs time to conquer the whole field. It is constantly progressing, its limits are ever enlarging. All that is needed is time to make observation and experiment, to reduce its facts to scientific order, and there is no limit to its researches. They may even allow that an outward revelation is possible, but its office is merely to quicken a knowledge that we already possess. Thus, lord Herbert of Cherbury (1581 ), among the English Deists maintained that we have in us naturally all that is made known in revelation. Our innate ideas of God, of the nature of virtue, of repentance as an expiation for sin, of rewards and punishments, of worship, &c., are precisely the same as the truths of revelation, but he was willing to allow that on account of man's dullness in learning, God might interpose by a revelation to bring them more clearly to our minds. But this is at once yielding the necessity of a revelation, and maintaining the sufficiency of reason for all man's wants.

It is true that Dr. Shields opposes this conclusion. He holds that a revelation is necessary. But when he says, p. 525, "There can be no truly rational theology without a revealed theology as its counterpart and supplement," and, "Until God makes Himself known to us by some objective revelation, in some apocalypse more direct and personal than His mere creation and providence, our knowledge of Him must remain partial and erroneous, while the actual addition to that knowledge by means of such divine communication has ever only had the effect of imparting to it greater unity, precision, and completeness," it is easy to see that revelation

and religion are regarded as merely coördinate with scientific knowledge, and their design is to carry on this latter to completion.

Now our criticism here is, that these two, scientific knowledge and the knowledge we attain through revelation, do not stand in this relation of equality. We do not propose to argue the point here, but merely to assert it. It is the same mistake that is made when men assert that religion is one among many interests, and that it comes in merely to complement them. We maintain that the idea of religion is not just coördinate with other ideas, even the greatest with which we have to do in our natural human life, but that it is only in religion that any human interest can realize its own ideal. Take the idea of the good as we have to do with it in morality or ethics. The order here is, not that man can attain to a complete morality, and then religion comes as an addition to it, in order to complete our spiritual life; but morality itself can be actualized only in religion. Religion in a deep sense is the whole of man, because it must enter every department of his life in order that completion at any point may be reached. In the same way now, we say, the truth or contents of revelation, coming from a supernatural, spiritual world is like the one sheaf in Joseph's dream,—it must swallow up all the rest. Not that we would make a dualism between reason and revelation, as the school of supra-naturalists did in the 17th century. All truth, whether natural or revealed, is one; but the truth of revelation is not related to the truth of science in the way of mere addition and extension—complementary in that sense—but as that in which and by which only the latter in any and every part can become complete in itself. This will appear more plainly as we go on to remark that,

II. The theory of Dr. Shields implies that the apprehension, or method of knowing, is the same in both. Man comes to know supernatural or revealed truth by the same mental powers and in the same way that he knows the truth of science. The difference being only one of degree; all that is necessary is that revelation should assist scientific knowledge in coming to its perfection, when it will take in the whole realm of possible knowledge, including both science and revelation. Thus he says: "the historical goal of the whole scientific process, ever to be approached even if never attained, is the absorption of positive in absolute science or perfect knowledge." But just here it is that the principle of rationalism

ever entrenches itself. It is the exaltation of the mere knowing faculty, man's mere intellect, to supremacy, as all-sufficient in itself for the apprehension of truth, whereas this is just man's curse, this divorce of the intellectual from the ethical and spiritual. It was this inordinate desire *to know*, apart from obedience and love, which caused man's fall. "Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Truth, as something living, can come into the intellect in its full power, only when it is at the same time owned and honored in the heart, or the will. Originally these two were married in one holy conjugal relation. Sin divorced them. The intellect acting alone can only take in the semblances of truth, mere empty phantoms, the idols of the mind. In this form truth has as yet no true spiritual contents. Hence, everywhere the Scriptures use the word *to know* in a different sense from the mere activity of the intellect as exercised in the much lauded scientific knowledge. To know in Scripture signifies not *notional* knowledge, but *essential* knowledge, carrying with it a personal communication with the object. "This is eternal life, *to know* thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent" (John xvii. 3). The true knowledge of Christ and divine things is very different from what is called scientific knowledge. It is reached only by restoring the original relation, or union, of will and intellect through divine grace, which sin has divorced. No one can come to a knowledge of Christ through a purely intellectual process. It requires the opening of the spiritual eye in man to recognise Him as the Lord, as God. Hence, when Peter made the great confession, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, our Lord says to him, flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. We might perhaps state the process to be this: first a certain knowledge enters the intellect, which as yet is lifeless, having no positive contents for the life of the individual. Secondly, it penetrates the heart or will where it engages his love. Thirdly, it then returns into the mind as now a living thing. Whether this explanation is correct or not, the fact of the difference is clear. A person may know what charity is in one way, he may have a description of it, say the description of St. Paul, but he cannot truly know what it is until he possesses it himself. And this is only saying what is conceded by all Christians, that we can know the truth as it is in Christ only by faith.

III. The error of the author comes out most fully in the position that *philosophy is the umpire* to decide and determine the reconciliation and union of science and religion. If the author had said that the agreement of these two in so far as it can be apprehended by reason comes to its expression in *Christian philosophy*, or the philosophy which believers in Christianity would adopt, we could accept his statement. This would be a philosophy in which Christianity is umpire, a philosophy which accepts Christ as the world's great teacher. But this is not the idea of the author we are reviewing. He means philosophy as based on natural reason, a philosophy which both reason and religion could adopt. Here arises the great difficulty in the author's scheme. Philosophy is to be the umpire, but whose or what philosophy? If philosophy, in the usual sense, then reason is at last exalted to the position of supreme judge on all questions of difference between science and religion, and this is the essence of rationalism from the time of Abelard down to the latest development in the great philosophical systems of Germany. The umpire here must stand above both. Christianity then is reduced to the position of one among the circle of sciences, albeit it claims revealed truth for its contents.

But is not Christianity reasonable? Must it not authenticate itself to reason ultimately? Is it not the highest reason? And as the truth of science and the truth of revelation are one, and from the same God, does it not follow that when science has done its full work, and religion become properly understood, their harmony must become apparent? Yes, we answer, provided they are both apprehended from the stand-point of faith. But here is the fallacy in the author's theory. This harmony can become apparent only to regenerate reason. It is not possible to make it apparent in any system of philosophy for a believer and an unbeliever. What would you do with such men as belong to the school of Darwin, Herbert, Spencer, Tyndall, Renan, &c.? They start in all their investigations from the stand-point of unbelief. There is no power in mere reason to convince such a man as Renan of the existence of the supernatural in Christ or Christianity. This must be so if we believe that the supernatural can be apprehended only by regenerate reason. So long as men are believers and unbelievers, the conflict between science and religion must remain. Their agreement, harmony, and union can only come when the original union



and harmony of the reason and the will of man is restored under the power of divine grace.

They will never come together in the way this work points out, that is by each one going its own course until each reaches its last results and expecting that then the two will harmonize. The difficulty lies at the beginning, for here as always the end rules and determines the beginning. Without the light of revealed truth science gropes in the dark from the very start, and the farther it progresses the more it departs from the truth as it is in Christ. It would require more space and time than we can here devote to the subject to show this. Our position would seem at first to deny the independent rights of reason and science, to destroy the objective homogeneity of the natural and supernatural, and contradict plain facts, as for instance the progress of science even in the heathen-world. We cannot now enter upon a consideration of this aspect of the general subject, as our object is rather to state our objections to the positions of the author whose work we are noticing than to discuss in a positive way the subject itself, and this especially because we are favored with such a discussion elsewhere in the present number of this Review. As, however, it is only fair that in controversy an opponent should state his own position we shall in conclusion, briefly and in a general way, give our view.

We hold that truth is everywhere one, but as truth in its higher forms must always illumine truth in its lower forms, so we hold that Christianity, as the absolute religion is the umpire over the whole realm of truth. Religion must rule in the realm of science as well as in what is called its own particular sphere. The Word of God is the key to all truth, because Christ is the truth and the light of the world. The reconciliation can be effected only by science acknowledging the supremacy of the Word of God.

But, it may be said, the Bible does not profess to teach science. Can it be the umpire in studying Arithmetic, or Astronomy, or Geography? Is not science independent of religion, of the teaching of the Bible, so far as such subjects are concerned? Let us see. We know the true meaning of one science only in its relation to another and to the whole circle of sciences, and we know the meaning of the whole circle of sciences only in the light of a true philosophy, and we know the meaning of true philosophy only in the light of the Word of God. Men may blunder egregiously in their

attempts to put these things together, we grant, as when the Roman Church attempted, as is said, to coerce Galileo to recant his assertion that the world moves around the sun. But this does not change the fact that the light of God's Word in revelation must reach out and illumine the whole realm of truth, out even to the ultimates of creation.

But who then is to determine this relation? Who is to connect the divine word through all these links with the various phases of scientific truth? This perhaps Dr. Shields would say is the very question in discussion. Not philosophy independently considered, we reply, not natural reason, but regenerated reason. The Christian philosopher is the only true philosopher, and in saying this we acknowledge the supremacy of the divine word in revelation. Is not, it may still be asked, this the position of the Roman Church, which sought to coerce reason and science in the Middle Ages? No; for it does not imply that because the Word of God is supreme therefore the pope is its infallible expounder. Nor does it imply that where science contradicts the Bible it is to be coerced into obedience. Nor does it imply that the teaching of the Bible is to be applied directly to the settlement of scientific questions, as those imagine who suppose that the first chapter in Genesis contains a theory of Geology or Astronomy. None of these things.

The Word of God in the Bible has to do primarily with man's regeneration in the new creation. It is a revelation of the supernatural, spiritual world. But as this spiritual world is the real substantial foundation as well as completion of the merely natural creation, the light that comes from thence is the only true light for the apprehension of truth in any form. The true meaning of the natural can be apprehended only in the light of the supernatural. Of course, many questions here remain unanswered, but our object is to maintain the broad general truth that eventually all forms of truth must acknowledge the supremacy of the Word of God in the Christian revelation. When that is done, science and religion will be on the right road to reconciliation and harmony. Till then science is doomed to grope in the dark. The theory that philosophy is the umpire between them appears to us to be the baldest rationalism, and such ultimate philosophy to be nothing better than *Ultimate infidelity*.

GLIMPSSES OF THE COMING. By Richard Gleason Greene, Minister of the Trinity Church, Orange, New Jersey. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company. 900 Broadway.

A thoughtful and suggestive little work of 146 pages—little in external size, but weighty in thought. The author assumes that his readers know something of Bible subjects, and he does not waste space in his book in telling them what they already know; but his object is to lead them on to new thoughts on the subjects treated. His book is divided into three general parts; 1st, The Son of Man as the Coming One; 2d, The Millennial Coming of the Son of Man; and 3d, The Coming of the Son of Man in Final Judgment.

The brief opening chapter presents The Son of Man—The Life in the Written Word. The Word of the Lord which abideth forever is the living testimony of The Living God uttering itself *through and in the life of man*. "The Testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of Prophecy." Then follows a chapter on the Kingdom of the Son of Man. This introduces the main topic, The Consummate Coming. Perhaps a few quotations will best exhibit the views and style of the author. On the subject of The Last Great Epoch,—The Coming of the Son of Man in Final Judgment, he says: "The final coming of Christ—the ultimate manifestation of the Son of God from the Heavens, in an awful Glory of love, life and power, beneath which the hosts of the Apostacy sink as under a lightning-stroke; while by His Presence the very elements of external Nature are dissolved (Heb. xii. 27: 2 Pet. iii. 7, 10-13; Rev. x. 5-7), and matter vanishes instantly into that deeper reality of which it had been but the symbol and the agent; and all humanity on the earth, and in all infernal spheres, and in whatever celestial spheres, which has not as yet gathered unto Him, is drawn in before Him in Whom it lives and has its being, and presents itself in general Resurrection and perfect revelation under the absolute Light and Truth of Him Who even in the Flesh could say—"I am the Light:" "I am the Truth." This Final Coming is not, and cannot possibly be, in this visible material sphere: it is *unto* the material, which instantly fades and passes from before it, fleeing "as a dream when one awaketh." Therefore no *bodily* eyes shall see it: they that are in the Flesh shall be changed "in the twinkling of an eye." It is said above and elsewhere in this treatise, that Matter, at Christ's Final Coming, fades, passes, vanishes, is dissolved into its deepest

spiritual reality. This fully accords with Holy Scripture: but there may be difficulty in deciding whether the fact thus revealed is to be taken as the historical and actual end of the matter itself of our world, or as the final instantaneous transfer of the race out of all relations to the present material sphere. If any minds find the latter more manageable by their thought, it may be taken as fully meeting the Scriptural statement; as we speak of the world, as fading, vanishing from around the dying, while *they* are passing away from *it*. This possible alternative for our thought regarding the final disposition of *matter*, is to be noted at all those points in this treatise where it is not duly stated. As to matter, since we know not yet what it is, how shall we say what is to become of it when man has outgrown it?" The author himself evidently leans to the view that "matter will resolve itself into its ultimate spiritual substance," and thus vanish away as the symbol disappears when the substance appears.

Of the Millennium he says: "The Millennium must begin with Christ and it must begin in the Heavens: its first and chief developments of all manner of force and result must be *there*: thence it must project itself as the epoch of a great and real advent of Christ into the whole Church below; thence further, since the Church holds Christ in stewardship for a lost world, it must project itself through the Church to the whole out-lying humanity, as a savor either of life unto life, or of death unto death: thence even further, it may be (we know not; but *it may be*), this great wave of Christ's all conquering power is to reach the painful regions of the un-Christlike departed, carrying a strange excitement thither—a premonitory tremor of the final Judgment Day—as they shall behold Satan, Prince of all ungodly Powers, the Angel of the Abyss, withering from before this new Presentation of Christ's glory, as though seized by a great Angel from on high and cast like lightning into the Abyss, and shut and sealed therein."

After giving a glowing description of the effect of Christ's first Advent on nature, when nature was made as it were, to reel and stagger, but when the power of the supernatural was so restrained as to prevent a dissolution of the natural, he adds: "But when He shall come the second time, it shall be the Day of His Glory, in which He shall not be veiled, but revealed from the highest Heaven, and the material things shall vanish and be as

though they had never been. What we call nature, real and indispensable as it is for the purposes for which Christ now administers it, is evidently a transient organism correspondent to the body of man which it enspheres and conveys. It is a beautifully adjusted system of check and balance and flow, through which may pass and act with limitations needful for our mortal existence, that *supernatural life* which, given at first from The Son of God, and moment by moment continued from Him, is ever working through all the immense mechanism of visible things; so that the most common and familiar facts in all the world around us, are yet the hiding-places of an eternal mystery, and the most ordinary natural processes are fully charged with a supernatural and immeasurable power. All the course of Nature is but the course in the Divine manifestation in the sphere of Humanity: in the Day when that manifestation shall stand complete, Humanity will have no farther use for such materials and forces: they shall have reached their ultimate. Christ comes: they vanish away: Lo! THE NEW HEAVENS AND A NEW EARTH!"

The writer's sentences are too long and involved, he uses too many capital letters, and there is a lack of precision and conciseness: but with all these faults of style, and imperfections or incompleteness of thought, he evidently is on a better track than the common religious thinking of the day. He finds reality and not mere abstraction in the spiritual world, and sees that the whole order of creation is ruled from thence, that the Word of God is the abiding substance of that world, by which it is animated and upheld, and that Christ, exalted on the throne of the universe is the divine personal source of that Word, whom the heavens and the earth are to worship as the only true and living God. We are inclined to think his view of nature and matter is correct. It is an *ignis fatuus* to such scientists as Huxley, Tyndall & Co., who undertake to explain what it is, while they deny the order of spiritual being, which supports and upholds it. They are like men who should spend their lives in undertaking to resolve and analyze a *shadow*, while refusing to believe that it is produced by a real object. They reverse the order of St. Paul and look at the things that are seen, while they refuse to look at those that are invisible, and find nothing in the end but a delusion.

We have said thus much on this little work, because we regard it, with all its imperfections, as moving in a better line of thought in its treatment of the relation of the spiritual to the natural world than the popular method of thinking. Besides it is modest in its spirit and pretensions. The author is not dogmatic. He does not pretend to know everything about the great theme on which he writes. He proposes questions and presents his views on them, but always in such a way as to induce thought on the part of the reader. We recommend his book as profitable reading for

Sunday-school teachers and advanced scholars in Sunday-schools, and as equally worthy of a place in the libraries of such ministers as feel that they have not yet mastered all questions pertaining to the Coming of Christ.

The price is *one Dollar*.

FAITH AND PHILOSOPHY: Discourses and Essays By Henry B. Smith, D. D., LL. D. Edited with an Introduction by George L. Prentiss, D. D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, in the city of New York. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Company, 1877.

This is a posthumous work of one of America's best theologians. This reputation he had won, not only in his native land, but also across the ocean. Upon receiving the sad tidings of his death, Dr. Dörner wrote: *Sehr schmerzlich hat mich der Tod von Henry B. Smith berührt. Ich habe ihn als einen der ersten, wenn nicht als ersten Americanischen Theologen der Gegenwart angesehen; fest-gegründet im Christlichen Glauben, frei und weiten Herzens und Blickes, philosophischen Geistes und für systematische Theologie ungewöhnlich begabt. Möcht doch etwas in dieser Hinsicht aus seinem Nachlass veröffentlicht werden.* This wish is gratified in the publication of this excellent volume which will be welcomed especially by his friends and admirers on this side the ocean. It is a beautiful tribute to his memory as well as a valuable contribution to our theological literature.

A considerable portion of the interest of the work attaches to the brief Introductory Notice by Dr. Prentiss. This gives a short account of Prof. Smith's life. He was born in Portland, Maine, Nov. 21st, 1815; and died Feb. 7th, 1877, in the sixty-second year of his age. He studied in Bowdoin College, and at Bangor and Andover, afterwards at the universities of Halle and Berlin. After his return from Europe he taught a year in Bowdoin College, during the absence of President Woods in Europe, then for five years he served as pastor over a Congregational Church in West Amesbury, Massachusetts. During a part of this time he gave instruction in Hebrew at Andover. In 1847 he became professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy at Amherst College. In 1850 he was called to the chair of Church History in Union Seminary, New York, and in 1855 he was called to the chair of Systematic Theology in the same. During the latter years of his life he suffered from ill-health, which required him at times to remit his regular labours. He occupied a prominent position in the Presbyterian Church, and exerted great influence in favour of the movement resulting in reuniting the two divisions, the Old and the New School. The only work he ever published is the *History of the Church of Christ in Chronological Tables*, a work indeed of rare value. But his life and labours prove that a man may be great, great as a scholar, thinker, and theologian, without writing many books.

The present volume contains a selection from his essays, articles, and addresses. We give the titles of a few of them in order that



the reader may form some idea of their character. The first is on *The Revelation of Faith and Philosophy*, then follow, *The Nature and Worth of the Science of Church History*, *The Reformed Churches of Europe and America in relation to general Church History*, *The Idea of Christian Theology as a System*, Sir William Hamilton's *Theory of Knowledge*, Whedon on the Will, Renan's *Life of Jesus*, *The New Faith of Strauss*, &c. They are living themes, discussions that connect themselves with the present struggle of Christianity with unbelief. Professor Smith seemed to have a keen sense of the deadly character of this conflict. "No man who loves the Christian faith, no man who is alive to the spirit of the times, as every man ought to be alive, can have failed to feel, to see, or to forebode the coming of a conflict between the mightiest powers that sway the destiny of man." Like all profound thinkers of the present age he seemed to anticipate a great crisis in the conflict between the opposing forces of belief and unbelief. One of his latest articles is the one on the New Faith of Strauss. But it is unnecessary to dwell longer on the writings of one so well known in the American Church as Henry B. Smith.

HERMENEUTICS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Dr. A. Immer, Professor of Theology in the University of Berne. Translated from the German by Albert H. Newman, Andover: Warren F. Draper, Main Street, 1877.

Prof. Immer, in this work, gives the results of the latest and ripest study on the subject which he treats. Judged from its own stand-point it may be pronounced an able work. It is well arranged and specially adapted for use in the class-room, while it may be studied with interest also by the general reader. It gives the methods and appliances necessary to understand the natural text of the Bible, particularly of the New Testament. But while this may be necessary for the professional teacher and student, it must certainly be regarded as the least important requisite for obtaining the spiritual sense of the Word of God. That Word, from beginning to end, is a revelation of the spiritual world and treats of man's regeneration. Hence it is clear that we are not to look to it for scientific knowledge in regard to the natural order of creation. As well might we raise the question whether our Lord in His parable of the Tares and the Wheat intends to teach Botany, and discuss then whether His teaching here agrees with human science, as to suppose that the Bible anywhere is to be interpreted as to its spiritual meaning in the light of mere science of any kind. It is a question whether this natural analysis of the letter of the Bible does not often conceal rather than reveal its hidden sense, which (hidden sense) can be apprehended only by the spiritual mind. For a discussion of this subject we refer the reader to two articles, one by Dr. J. W. Nevin, and the other by Dr. E. V. Gerhart, in the present number of this Review. The subject is important and demands



attention by Biblical scholars. In our exaltation of human knowledge we may be in danger of darkening counsel by words, and losing sight of spiritual and angelic wisdom.

THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY. With a view of the State of the Roman World at the Birth of Christ. By George O. Fisher, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College; Author of "Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity," "The Reformation," etc. New York: Scribner & Co. 1877.

We took occasion some time ago to give our estimate of this work in the *Messenger*. It has met with a very favorable reception on every side. Even the *Catholic World* in the January number gives it a highly favorable notice, devoting a whole article to the subject. A theological work that satisfies both Romanist and Protestant must hit on a theme that is fundamental and catholic in its nature. This we have in the author's views of the historical character of Christianity. It is a theme which has attained prominence in our age, more especially since Neander wrote on the subject. Certainly no view of history can be sound which does not make the Incarnation the great central fact of all time. This is the key that must unlock the mystery of man and his destiny. From this great centre the events in the preceding history of the world become a grand preparation for the advent of the Son of God, and the events in succeeding history become, in one way or another, virtually connected with the unfolding of the kingdom of God on earth. This more profound view of the incarnation came indeed as a deliverance from the mechanical and dualistic theory of revelation which prevailed in the school of supra-naturalists. That school maintained a dualism between the natural and the supernatural. The one hovered over the other as a ghostly spiritualism, and therefore everything miraculous in Christianity came to be regarded as anti-natural as well as supra-natural. Viewed in the light of the incarnation, however, a different and better view of the relation between nature and the supernatural has come to prevail. Christianity is regarded as organically uniting itself with the flow of human history, and Church-history becomes the most central and controlling element in universal history.

The weightiest portion of Dr. Fisher's work is the introductory chapter on the nature of revelation—a theme which has engaged the profoundest thinking of modern times—the depths of which have by no means yet been fully sounded. It is here, if anywhere, we would take exception to some of the author's positions. Particularly in his treatment of the relation between revelation in the divine Word and revelation in a historical form in the events of history, he seems to become involved in difficulties from which he fails to extricate himself. He says, "The grand aim, under the Old Dispensation, and the New, was, not the production of a Book, but the training of a people. To raise up and train up a nation that

should become a fit instrument for the moral regeneration of mankind was the aim of the old system. . . . The Hebrew people were in the end fitted for the office which, even in the far-distant past, they were expected to fulfill." Again he says, "The Scriptures which, when collected into a volume, are the records and monuments of this long process of divine training. They are the original documents through which we get an authentic knowledge of the historical process in its consecutive stages."

If it was the object of Old Testament revelation "to raise up and train up a nation that should become a fit instrument for the moral regeneration of mankind," then it proved in the end a failure, for the Jews, instead of performing this mission, turned against God and crucified the Lord. Unless we take the position that this was the method by which they were preordained to accomplish the regeneration of mankind, they certainly failed in their mission. Our Lord Himself and the apostles charge them with their utter unfaithfulness and diabolical hatred of all that is good.

With this view of Old Testament revelation the author finds himself involved in inextricable difficulties when he attempts to explain the ethics of the Old Testament. The imperfect morality of that revelation he attributes, in part, at least, to the rudimentary training of the people. Thus he finds the maledictions in the Psalms to be referable not only to sympathy with divine justice, but also to feelings of personal revenge! The 109th psalm is held up in contrast with the sermon on the Mount.

All this we regard as the weak position of the book. The revelation in the Old Testament is primarily in and through the Word of God, which is quite a different thing from the apprehension of it by the Jewish people. That revelation is pure and holy, and to suppose that the divine Word there conflicts in any way with our Lord's teaching is to make God contradict Himself. The Word of God it is which abideth forever, and the truth of God in the Old Testament it is which constitutes the revelation there. "Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar."

The holy Scriptures are infinitely more than merely "the records and monuments of this long process of divine training" of the Jewish nation. But our limits do not allow of more than this mere reference to what we regard as a one-sided view of divine revelation.

The chapters on the preparations in Judaism and heathenism for Christianity are very fine. So are also those on the Plan of Jesus, and the Separation of the Church from the Temple. Of course in such a work one expects to find much that others have written before; but no one can follow Dr. Fisher without being impressed that he is an independent and original thinker, and that his thorough scholarship does not allow him to depend on second-hand material. His work at once takes rank with those of the ablest scholars and best thinkers that have written on this subject.